

(Socinus, F.)

Biogr.

1100^b

Toulmin

50

<36628699320010

S

<36628699320010

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

M E M O I R S
OF THE
LIFE, CHARACTER, SENTIMENTS,
AND
W R I T I N G S,
OF
FAUSTUS SOCINUS.

By JOSHUA TOULMIN, A. M.

*Some said, He is a good Man: Others said, Nay; but
he deceiveth the People. JOHN.*

By Faith he forsook Ægypt. PAUL.

L O N D O N:

Printed for the AUTHOR by J. BROWN, at the Portable Printing-Press, Fair Street, Horsly-down, SOUTHWARK; and sold by J. JOHNSON, No. 72, St. Paul's Church Yard,

M.DCC.LXXVII.

M E M O I R S

OF THE

REV. RICHARD HARRISON,
LIFE, CHARACTER, SENTIMENTS,
FORMERLY OF TAUNTON,

AS A

PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF HIGH ESTEEM
FOR HIS CHARACTER,

AND

WARM GRATITUDE
FAUSTUS

SINGULAR AND GENEROUS FRIENDSHIP

THOMAS WATSON, A.M.

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

TO THE PEOPLE OF TAUNTON

BY HIS AFFECTIONATE FRIEND, PAUL

AND MUCH OBLIGED FRIEND, JAMES

Printed for the Author by J. Brown, at the Printing-
Office, No. 21, South Street, Boston, 1841.
LONDON: Printed by J. G. Allen, at the Printing-
Office, No. 21, South Street, Boston, 1841.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

TO THE
Rev. RICHARD HARRISON,
FORMERLY OF TAUNTON,
AS A
PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF HIGH ESTEEM
FOR HIS CHARACTER,
AND OF
WARM GRATITUDE
FOR HIS
SINGULAR AND GENEROUS FRIENDSHIP,
THIS WORK
IS
RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

By his very affectionate Friend,

And much obliged humble Servant,

THE AUTHOR;

TO THE

Rev. RICHARD HARRISON,

FORMERLY OF TAVISTOCK, E.

A. S. A.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF HIGH ESTEEM

THE *Descent of the Spirit* in the Life here offered
to the Public was suggested by the Author's meeting
with an Account of SOCRATES in the Works of PLATO

W. A. R. M., a Polish Knight, Titular Count, Narrative
concerned to contribute to the Cause of

SINGULAR ABILITY and Virtue to exhibit to more general View
Character which appeared to him to be, in reality, but
little known.

12

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

already published by BIRBE and in Biography

By his Disposition, and his and impartial as to his
the present attempt.

And much obliged humble Servant,

He was inclined to hope that a review of the
LIFE and OPINIONS of the AUTHOR
would be a foundation of a
religious

P R E F A C E.

THE Design of drawing up the Life here offered to the Public was suggested by the Author's meeting with an Account of SOCINUS in the Works of PRZIECOVIUS, a Polish Knight. From this Narrative he was led to conclude it would be of service to the Cause of Religion and Virtue to exhibit to more general View a Character which appeared to him to be, in reality, but little known.

Nor does he apprehend the accounts of SOCINUS, already published by BIDLE and in Biographical Dictionaries, are so full and impartial as to supersede the present attempt.

He was inclined to hope that a review of the Life and Opinions of so distinguished a Founder of a religious

religious Sect would interest those to whom an enquiry after religious truth appears important, and afford entertainment to the curiosity of others.

And he has been happy to find that the sentiments of many very respectable persons, whose encouragement of this work does him no small honour, have coincided herein with his own. He deems himself greatly indebted to their friendship in promoting this publication; and begs them to accept his warm and grateful acknowledgements of the patronage with which they have, very obligingly favoured it.

How far the attempt is adapted to answer their expectations and wishes he must refer to their candour; which he does with the greater confidence, as he has already received very encouraging proofs of it.

In excuse for its defects and errors he may be allowed to plead, that he found it difficult to procure materials for furnishing an account of the Man, though numerous have been the publications relative to the Sentiments that bear his name. — That his design was not to compose a critical history of SOCINIANISM, but to draw the
Character

Character of SOCINUS in that familiar and popular manner in which he would represent the life of any great and good man.—And that, in his translations from the works of SOCINUS, he aimed principally at fidelity, and judged it right to sacrifice to that the freedom and ornaments of style.

The delay, with which this publication has been attended, has given the Author an opportunity to enlarge it with new matter, beyond what was at first proposed. After all, he submits it to the public eye with much diffidence and fear: though his aim, he trusts, has been higher than to secure the reputation of a good writer; even to correct ill-founded prejudices, to animate rational zeal, and to excite some to piety, virtue and integrity. These are important and valuable objects, very favourable to the best interests of mankind, and worthy our most vigorous efforts to promote.

He will conclude, in this connection, with a quotation from LACTANTIUS, as he finds it used by a distinguished Author and an excellent Person.

“ But,

“ But, if life be an object of desire to a wise man,
 “ truly, I could wish to live for no other end but to do
 “ something worthy of life ; and which may enable the
 “ Reader, not to be more learned and eloquent, to
 “ which I can form but little pretensions, but to be a
 “ good man, which is the chief thing of all. And this,
 “ if I can but accomplish, I shall think I have lived
 “ long enough and fulfilled my duty as a man, if, by
 “ any labours of mine, some few may be delivered from
 “ error and directed in their road to Heaven*.”

* LINDSEY's Apology, Pref. P. 5.

SUBSCRIBERS



CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - P. i—xvii

CHAPTER I.

A narrative of the birth and principal incidents of SOCINUS's Life - - - - -	P. 1—16
The disadvantages attending his education - - -	2, 3
His marriage - - - - -	8
The accumulated afflictions that befel him - -	9—11
His death - - - - -	11, 12
The epitaph on his tomb - - - - -	13
His dispute with FRANKEN - - - - -	13
An account of his daughter - - - - -	14, 15
ASHWELL's character of SOCINUS - - - - -	15

CHAPTER II.

The moral and religious character of SOCINUS	17—153
SECT. I. The firmness of his faith and his attach- ment to immortality - - - - -	18—35
His remark to one who had built a tomb for himself	21
PRZIECOVIUS's comparison of SOCINUS with IGNA- TIUS and others - - - - -	22—27
HOORNBECK animadverted upon - - - - -	27, 28
CALVIN's situation - - - - -	29
	SECT.

SECT. 2. The zeal of SOCINUS — P. 35—52

His sentiments concerning those who are indifferent to religious truth	— — —	37
His descent and family	- - -	38—40
His departure from the court of <i>Tuscany</i>	- - -	41—46
WHISTON's reflections on courts	— — —	42—44
His labours	— — —	47
DUDITH, an account of him (<i>a note</i>)	- - -	47, 48
SOCINUS's sentiments on martyrdom	- - -	48—50
———— disinterestedness	— — —	51

SECT. 3. His candour and moderation — 52—123

GROSVENOR's sentiments on zeal	- - -	52
DODDRIDGE's remarks on the same	— — —	53
SOCINUS's justice to the abilities of others	— — —	54
———— charitable opinion of the state of others	— — —	55—60
———— sentiments of writing anonymous pieces	- - -	64
Specimens of the strain and spirit of his controversial writings	— — —	67—74
CALVIN's treatment of CASTALIO (<i>a note</i>)	- - -	74
SOCINUS's opinion concerning the doctrine of putting heretics to death	— — —	75, 76
His sentiments concerning the salvation of PAPISTS	- - -	78
———— charged with treating PALÆOLOGUS with acrimony, and his vindication of himself	- - -	79—81
———— accused of being accessory to the imprisonment and death of FRANCIS DAVID	- - -	82, 83
The charge denied by PRZEPKOVIUS	— — —	83
SOCINUS's vindication of himself from this imputation and other calumnies	- - -	85—93
Some Remarks on this affair	- - -	94, 95
SOCINUS approves the imprisoning of heretics	- - -	95
————'s idea of an <i>heresiarch</i> , and clears himself from the imputation of being one	- - -	98—102
SOCINUS		

SOCINUS remonstrates on the severe treatment he had received	— — — — —	P. 103—112
Remarks on SOCINUS's opinion concerning the imprisoning of heretics	— — — — —	112, 113
LUTHER's sentiments on the same subject	— — — — —	114
SCHLICHTINGIUS's liberal sentiments on it	— — — — —	115—118
Reflections on the state of <i>Europe</i> before and since the reformation	— — — — —	120, 121
GROSVENOR quoted	— — — — —	122
SECT. 4. His self-government	— — — — —	123—140
His disinterestedness and generosity	— — — — —	124, 125
His mastery over the animal appetites	— — — — —	125
His obliging and affectionate temper	— — — — —	126
His modesty and self-diffidence	— — — — —	127—132
His self-command under ill treatment	— — — — —	136, 137
The reflections of PRZIPCOWIUS on this head	— — — — —	139
SECT. 5. His piety	— — — — —	140—152
General reflections on the importance of piety	— — — — —	140, 141
His devotedness to the will of God	— — — — —	142—145
His resignation under painful events	— — — — —	145—147
The serious strain of his letters	— — — — —	147—151
His critique on 1 <i>Cor.</i> iii. 6, 7	— — — — —	152

CHAPTER III.

The Sentiments of SOCINUS.

SECT. 1. The temper and views with which he conducted his researches	— — — — —	155—171
PRZIPCOWIUS's reflection on the education of SOCINUS	— — — — —	155, 156
SOCINUS's openness to conviction and freedom from prejudices	— — — — —	157—160

His advice to a certain lady	— —	P. 161
His professed reverence for the Scriptures		162—164
The author of the <i>Dictionnaire des Heresies</i> quoted		165
Dr. WALLIS's charge against SOCINUS, of putting designedly a force on the Scriptures, stated, and considered	— —	166—170
SECT. 2. The opinions of SOCINUS — — 172—254		
§. 1. A summary of the Christian religion		172—176
§. 2. On the duty of a Christian	—	176, 177
§. 3. On the death of CHRIST and its efficacy; his power, mediation and nature	— —	178—208
The humanity and divine sonship of CHRIST		178, 179
A comparison between the power of CHRIST and that of earthly kings	— —	179, 180
The filiation of CHRIST farther explained		180, 181
CHRIST's ascension into heaven prior to his ministry on earth	— —	182—184
The priesthood of CHRIST and his expiating our sins considered	— —	185—188
What is meant by GOD's being propitious in CHRIST	— —	188—190
The title <i>Mediator</i> explained	—	190—192
In what sense CHRIST was the Lamb of God, and took away the sins of the world	—	194—197
The efficacy of CHRIST's death, and its difference from that of the martyrs	—	197—199
The sovereign power of CHRIST proved		200—202
The extent of CHRIST's dominion		203, 204
The continual exercise of CHRIST's power and go- vernment asserted and proved	—	204—208
§. 4. His sentiments on the divine perfections, the original state of man, the fall, predestination and justification	— —	209—235
		The

The eternity of God proved from his absolute dominion — — —	P. 209, 210
The unity of God explained — — —	211, 212
His immensity explained — — —	212—214
The natural mortality of the first man argued for	214, 215
SOCINUS's opinion of the insufficiency of the light of nature — — —	216—218
A quotation from Dr. HARTLEY — — —	218—220
The meaning of the terms <i>original righteousness</i>	221, 222
Original sin, what — — —	222—225
Freedom of man's will explained and proved	226, 227
Divine assistance, external and internal — — —	227, 228
Predestination denied — — —	230
Four rules relative to the divine prescience — — —	231
The doctrine of justification explained	232—235
§. 5. The sentiments of SOCINUS on magistracy, war, punishments, resistance, self-defence, usury, the sacraments and the church — — —	235—254
Thoughts concerning the lawfulness of war	236, 237
— on dress — — —	237, 238
— on carrying of arms — — —	238, 239
— on usury: the law of MOSES on the point considered — — —	240—243
— on the use of blood — — —	243—247
— on the choice and power of ministers	248, 249
A note concerning the religious assemblies of the SOCINIANS — — —	249
SOCINUS's sentiments concerning the Lord's-Supper	250
On baptism, its use and perpetuity — — —	251, 252
On infant-baptism — — —	253
SECT. 3. The progress of SOCINIANISM; reflections on the opinions of SOCINUS; and the sentiments of different writers on his scheme — — —	255—318

The establishment and flourishing state of Socinianism	P. 256—259
An account of the <i>Racovian</i> catechism	259—269
Extracts from the preface to it	261—267
The plan and contents of it	267, 268
MosHEIM's remarks on it considered	269—271
The measures taken by the Socinians to propagate their sentiments	271, 272
A rash act of the students at <i>Racow</i>	272, 273
The Socinians banished from <i>Poland</i>	273, 274
A quotation from Mr. FIRMIN's life (<i>a note</i>)	274
Their dispersion and settlement in other countries	275—277
JOHN BIDDLE, a short account of him	278
——— forms a society	279
Mr. FIRMIN's catholic generosity (<i>a note</i>)	279
The progress of Socinianism: writers in that scheme	280—284
GROTIUS, the charge against him considered <i>note</i>	282, 283
HOPTON HAYNES, Esq. an account of him	284, 285
Reflections of the authors of the <i>Encyclopedie</i> on the progress of Socinianism	286, 287
Animadversions of different writers on this scheme	288—314
——— of HOORNBECK	288, 289
——— of JURIEU	289
——— of RELAND	289, 290
——— of BERRIMAN	290—292
A quotation from SMALCIUS on the dignity of CHRIST	293—296
Reflections of BEN MORDECAI on Socinianism	297, 298
——— of bishop TILLOTSON	298—301
——— of the writer of FIRMIN's life	301, 302
LE CLERC's view of the Socinian tenets	303, 310
Reflections	

Reflections of two popish writers	—	P. 310—314
Some general remarks	— — —	315—318

— CHAPTER IV.

An Account of the Works of SOCINUS.

A short explanation of the beginning of the first chapter of JOHN's gospel	— — —	320
His treatise <i>de auctoritate sacræ Scripturæ</i>	—	320
An account of the <i>Steinfurt</i> edition of this work	321,	322
Bishop SMALLBROKE's testimony to it	—	322
A summary of the Christian religion	—	323
His disputation concerning the state of the first man before the fall	— — —	324
His edition of CASTALIO's dialogues	—	324
Answer to the Theses of FRANCIS DAVID	-	325
A dissertation on baptism	— — —	325
His answer to ANDREAS VOLANUS	—	326
An exposition on the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the <i>Romans</i>	— — —	327, 328
An anecdote of an UNITARIAN minister's change of sentiment concerning the sense of that chapter		328
His answer to PALÆOLOGUS: PRZIRCOWIUS's opinion of this treatise	— — —	329
His animadversions on the assertions of the <i>Posnanian</i> divines	— — —	330, 331
A defence of the same against EUTROPIUS	-	332
The disputation with FRANKEN	—	332, 333
Some fragments and smaller pieces	—	333
His answer to ERASMUS JOHANNES	-	334
His edition of an ARISTOTELIAN scheme of doctrine		335
His synopsis on our justification	- - -	335
His refutation of JACOB VUJEKIUS	—	335
A defence of his piece on the seventh of <i>Romans</i>		336
His treatise on the duty of the EVANGELIC	337,	338

A commentary upon the first Epistle of JOHN	339
Theological lectures	339
Various tracts on the church	340
Miscellanies	340
Some posthumous pieces	341—344
A general catalogue of SOCINUS's works	344—346
The sentiments of BODECHER, BIDLE and PRZIECOWIUS concerning his writings	347, 348
Conclusion	349
The reflections of SOCINUS on the excellency of religious knowledge	352—353
A zeal for truth and the pure profession of Christianity recommended	354—358

APPENDIX. I.

SOCINUS's exposition of some verses in the first chapter of JOHN's Gospel	360—394
An anecdote of JUNIUS	394
Exposition of <i>Genesis</i> i. 16.	394
— of <i>Philippians</i> ii. 6, 7.	394—401
— of <i>2 Cor.</i> viii. 9.	401—404

APPENDIX. II.

An account of the <i>Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum</i>	405—407
The life of CRELLIUS	408
His education and attainments	408—409
The freedom of his enquiries	409
Nominated inspector of the youth of <i>Altorf</i>	409
Meets with opposition and declines the post	410
The difficulties that obstructed his religious enquiries	411
His removal to <i>Poland</i> , and the stations he filled there	412—414
His diligence and labours	414—415
His last sickness and death	415, 416
Some distichs on CRELLIUS	417
His	

338	His character, modesty, courteousness, meekness, fortitude and prudence	418—420
338	His works	420—423
340	The life of WOLTZOGENIUS	423—425
344	An anecdote concerning his death	425
346	Some distichs on him	425, 426
	His works	426
348	Life of SCHLICHTINGIUS	426—430
348	Anecdote concerning his death ; his character, and some distichs on him	431
352	His epitaph	432
	An historical account of his works	433—438
358	Reflections of his editors	438
	Preface to his commentaries	439
	Life of PRZIPCOWIUS	439—444
	His self-denial	441
364	His charity	442
364	Critique on 1 Cor. xv. 29. (a note)	442, 443
364	His character	444
401	His works	445, 446
404	His comparison of the apostles creed with modern creeds	446—452

APPENDIX III.

407	Propositions, explaining the opinions of FRANCIS DAVID and those of SOCINUS	453—463
408	Some remarks and reflections on the same, and on MOSHEIM	463 to the end.

SUBSCRIBERS

His character, modesty, courtesy, and
fortune and influence

His works

~~The life of Mr. [unclear]~~

An anecdote concerning his death

Some difficulties on him

His works

SUBSCRIBERS NAMES

Anecdote concerning his death; his character, and

Some difficulties on him

His epigraph

An historical account of his works

Reflections of his editors

THE NABOB OF ARCO

Rev. Mr. [unclear] [unclear]

Rev. Philip Adams, Trull, near Tanton

Rev. Mr. Alley, Chesterfield

Rev. Edward Armstrong, Reading

Rev. Mr. Alderton, Norwich

Mr. Samuel Amory

The composition of the apostle [unclear] with [unclear]

B.

George Brough, Esq. Treasurer of Guy's Hospital

Rev. Joseph Ireland, [unclear]

Rev. Nathaniel Britton, A. M. [unclear]

Mr. John Brien, [unclear]

Rev. Lionel Brown, [unclear]

Rev. Joseph Brown, London

Rev. Mr. Berry, [unclear]

Rev. Mr. Blythe, [unclear]

Rev. Thomas Barnes, near Bolton

Thomas Blackburne, M. D.

Mr. John Billington, [unclear]

Mr. William Boller, [unclear]

Mr. Richard Boller, [unclear]

Mr. Bryant, [unclear]

(1)

SUBSCRIBERS NAMES.

A

THE NABOB OF ARCOT.

Rev. Matthew Anstis, *Bridport.*

Rev. Philip Adams, *Trull, near Taunton.*

Rev. Mr. Attley, *Chesterfield.*

Rev. Edward Armstrong, *Reading.*

Rev. Mr. Alderson, *Norwich.*

Mr. Samuel Amory.

B.

George Brough, Esq. *Treasurer of Guy's-Hospital.*

Rev. Joseph Bretland, *Exeter.*

Rev. Nathaniel Bristed, A. M. *Sherborne.*

Mr. John Brent, *Rotherhithe.*

Rev. Lionel Brown, *Hampstead.*

Rev. Joseph Brown, *London.*

Rev. Mr. Berry, *Crediton, Six Copies.*

Rev. Mr. Blythe, *Birmingham.*

Rev. Thomas Barnes, near *Bolton.*

Thomas Blackburne, M. D.

Mr. John Billingsley, *Shepton-Mallet, Five Copies.*

Mr. William Buller, *Wilton, Two Copies.*

Mr. Richard Buller, *Honiton.*

Mr. Bryant, *Attorney at Law, Ilminster.*

Mr.

- Mr. Joseph Bryant, *Taunton.*
Mr. Peter Bryant, *Ditto.*
Mr. Nehemiah Bewsey, *Ditto.*
Mrs. Ann Boon, *Ditto.*
Mr. Bell, *London.*
Mr. William Boorman, *Maidstone.*
Mr. William Buck, *Merchant, Hallifax.*
Mr. William Bailey, *London.*
Mr. Brown, *Crewkerne.*
Mr. George Brooksbank, *London.*
Mr. Michael Burrow, *Salisbury.*
Mr. Brown, *Druggist, London.*

C.
John Collins, Esq. *Hatch, near Taunton.*
Richard Hall Clark, Esq. *Breedwell, near Uffculm.*
James Clyde, Esq. *Sheerness.*
John Carter, Esq. *Portsmouth.*
Christopher Chambers, Esq. *London.*
Rev. Dr. Chambers, *Alchurch, Northamptonshire.*
Rev. Mr. Coles, *Taunton.*
Rev. Newcome Cappe, *York.*
Rev. Joseph Cornish, *Colyton, Two Copies.*
Rev. Mr. Castle, *Hatherley.*
Thomas Cogan, M. D. *London.*
Joseph Cartelage, M. D. *Hallifax.*
Miss Chambers.
Miss Cross, *Taunton.*
Mr. Edward Cornish, *Ditto.*
Mr. John Capon, *Ditto.*
Mr. Cooper, *Chard.*
Mr. Samuel Cross, *Exeter.*
Mr. John Clark, *Newport, in the Isle of Wight.*
Mr. Richard Cooke, *Ditto.*
Mr. Thomas Cooke, *Ditto.*

Mr.

Mr. Cole, *Crewkerne*.
Mr. Clark, *Surgeon, Barnstaple*.
Mr. John Chubb, *Bridgewater*.
Mr. Benjamin Collins, *Salisbury*.
Mr. John Clitsome, *Taunton*.
Mr. John Chatfield, *Lewes*.
Anthony Chapman, Esq. *Kensington*.

D.

Thomas Darch, Esq. *Bishops-Hull, near Taunton*.
John Daniel, Esq. *Yeovil*.
George Daniel, Esq. *London*.
Samuel Daniel, Esq. *Ditto*.
John Dawson, Esq. *Ditto*.
Rev. Dr. Disney, *Swinderby, Lincolnshire*.
Michael Dickson, M. D. *Taunton*.
—— Dobson, M. D. *Liverpool*.
Rev. Job David, *Froome*.
Rev. John Deane, *Bradford, Yorkshire*.
Mr. Martin Dunsford, *Merchant, Tiverton, Three Copies*.
Mr. Dunsford, *Catler, Exeter*.
Mr. Duckett, *Merchant, Gosport*.
Mr. William Dickenson, *Hallifax*.
Mr. Davis, *Shepton-Mallet*.
Mr. Dendy, *London*.
Mr. Thomas Dyke, *Salisbury*.
Mr. Daniel Dyke, *Ditto*.
Mr. Nathaniel Downe, *Surgeon, Bridport*.
Mr. Samuel Daniel, *Yeovil*.
Mr. Dobson, *Merchant, Liverpool*.
Mrs. Dawson, *Ditto, Seven Copies*.

E.

Sir James Esdaile, *Knt.*
Rev. Caleb Evans, A. M. *Bristol*.
Rev.

Rev. Theophilus Edwards, *Tavistock.*
 Rev. Peter Emans, *Nottingham, Two Copies.*

F.

Francis Follaquier, Esq. *Taunton.*
 Edward Freeman, Esq. *Coventry.*
 Daniel Fox, Esq. *Binford, Berks.*
 Rev. Caleb Fleming, D. D. *Hoxton.*
 Rev. John Frank, *Bath.*
 Rev. James Foot, *Bradford, deceased.*
 Rev. Mr. Finnemore, *Exeter.*

F. E.

Mr. William Finch.
 Rev. Dr. Flexman, *Rotherhithe.*

G.

Ralph Gowland, Esq. *Member of Parl. for Cockermonth.*
 Ralph Griffiths, Esq.
 Rev. William Graham, *Hallifax, Two Copies.*
 Rev. Richard Godwin, *Gataker.*
 Mr. R. Goadby, *Sherborne, Four Copies.*
 Mr. James Green, *Exeter.*
 Mr. Thomas Grove, *Taunton.*
 Mr. Samuel Gundry, *Bridport.*
 Mr. Joseph Golding, *Ditto.*
 Mr. Thomas Gibbs, *Salisbury.*
 Mr. John Gifford, *Merchant, Exeter.*
 Mr. William Garnsey, *Banker, Bristol.*

H.

John Halliday, Esq. *Member of Parliament for Taunton.*
 William Hawker, Esq. *Poundisford, near Taunton.*
 Benjamin Hammet, Esq. *Taunton, Six Copies.*
 Mrs. Halliday, *Yard, near Taunton.*
 Edmund Halliday, Esq. *Ditto.*
 Thomas Brandt Hollis, Esq.

Samuel

Samuel Heywood, Esq. *London.*
 William Hoghton, Esq. *London.*
 William Huthwait, Esq. *Ham, near Richmond.*
 Rev. Mr. Hughes, *Vice-President of Queen's-College, Camb.*
 Rev. Edward Harwood, D. D.
 Henry Hinkley, M. D. *London.*
 Rev. Farnham Haskoll, *Taunton.*
 Rev. John Hogg, *Exeter.*
 Rev. Richard Harrison, *Leek.*
 Rev. William Hazlit, *Maidstone.*
 Rev. Lawrence Holden, *Malden.*
 Rev. Mr. Holden, *Tenterden.*
 Rev. John Hornbrook, *Plymouth.*
 Rev. William Hawkes, *Birmingham.*
 Rev. Michael Hook, *Branscomb, Devon.*
 Rev. Philip Holland, *Bolton.*
 Rev. Mr. Harrops, *Wem.*
 Mrs. Harris, *Honiton.*
 Mr. Clement Hirtzel, *Merchant, Exeter.*
 Mr. Joseph Harris, *Maidstone.*
 Mr. Christopher Harris, *Ditto.*
 Mr. Thomas Hill, *London.*
 Mr. Joseph Hodson, *Salisbury.*
 Mr. John Hotham, *York.*
 Mr. John Hounsell, sen. *Bridport.*
 Mr. Samuel Hayward, *Merchant, Liverpool.*
 Mr. Samuel Heywood, *Attorney, at Nottingham.*
 Mr. Hutchinson, *Smeaton, Yorkshire.*
 Rev. William Hopkins, *Cuckfield.*
 Dr. Heberden.
 J.
 Rev. Joseph Jeffries, L.L.D. *London, Three Copies.*
 Rev. John Jebb, *late Fellow of Peter-House, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Thomas Jervis, *Bew-Wood, near Calne.*

Rev.

Rev. John Jervis, *Lymston*.
 Rev. John Iggelsdon, *Headcorn*.
 Rev. Mr. Joy, *Smeaton, Yorkshire*.
 Rev. John Jones, *Newcastle Under-Line*.
 Rev. Mr. Jackson, *Coventry*.
 Mr. Edward Jeffries, *London, Seven Copies*.
 Mr. Joseph Jeffries, *Taunton, Three Copies*.
 Mr. Benjamin Jeffries, *Ditto*.
 Mr. Isaac Jemmet, *London*.
 Mr. Gilbert Jesser, *Worcester*.
 Mr. Jee, *London*.
 Mr. James Jagger, *Burnham*.

K.

James Kirkpatrick, Esq. *Bristol, Barrister at Law*,
Two Copies.

Rev. And. Kippis, D. D. *Tutor in the Academy at Hoxton*.
 Rev. Joseph Keech, *Ilminster, deceased*.
 Rev. Mr. Kirkup, *Abingdon*.
 Mr. Robert Kennaway, *Bridgewater*.
 Mr. William Kent, *Exeter*.
 Mr. John Katencamp, *Merchant, Exeter*.
 Mr. Kingdon, *Ditto*.

L.

Thomas Lucas, Esq.
 Rev. Mr. Lambert, *Fellow of Trinity-college, Cambridge*.
 Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, A. M. *London*.
 Rev. Edward Love, *Headcorn*.
 Rev. Thomas Love, *Cranbrook*.
 Rev. Robert Lewin, *Liverpool*.
 Rev. Mr. Lewes, *Stafford*.
 Rev. Mr. Lloyd, *Pudsey*.
 Rev. Mr. Lloyd, *Coventry, deceased*.
 Rev. Mr. Lomas, *Derby*.
 Mrs. Mary Ann Lutley, *Taunton*.

Mr;

Mr. Thomas Huckell Lee, *Merchant, Exeter.*

Mr. Stephen Love, *Headcorn.*

Mr. Lowdell, *London.*

Mr. John Larkcom, jun. *Ilminster.*

Mr. Joseph Lowe, *Nottingham.*

Mr. Michael Lovel.

M.

James Milnes, Esq. *Wakefield.*

John Mallack, Esq. *Hay-Grass, near Taunton.*

William Mills, Esq. *Bishops-Hull, near Taunton.*

John Merivale, Esq. *Exeter.*

Thomas Milner, M. D. *Maidstone.*

Rev. Mr. Morgan, *Exeter.*

Rev. Mr. Manning, *Ditto.*

Rev. Samuel Morgan, *Collumbton.*

Rev. Mr. Medcalfe, *Hackney.*

J. M. *Portsmouth.*

Mrs. Moore, *Taunton.*

Mrs. E. Moore, *Ditto.*

Mr. Thomas Mease, *Wilton.*

Mr. Philip Mallet, *London.*

Mr. William Mortimer, *Seven-oaks, Six Copies.*

Mr. John Mace, *Surgeon, Maidstone.*

Mr. John Margary, *London.*

Mr. Broughton Maysey, *Ditto.*

Mr. Robert Mercer, *Lewes.*

Mrs. Jane Moore, *Bridgewater.*

N.

Robert Newton, Esq. *Norton, Derbyshire.*

N. N.

Mr. Luke Noble, *Taunton.*

Mr. John Noble, *Ditto.*

Mr. John Norman, *Ditto.*

MM

Mr. Richard Northcote, *Honiton.*
 Mrs. Nation, *Exeter.*
 Mr. Padmore Noble, *Surgeon, Bristol.*

O.

Mr. Alderman Oliver.
 Rev. Job Orton, *Kidderminster.*
 Mr. Thomas Osler, *Bridgewater.*
 Mr. Thomas Ogborn, *Exeter.*
 Mr. Joel Ofeland, *London.*

P.

Alexander Popham, Esq. *Member of Parl. for Taunton.*
 James Pool, Esq. *Taunton, Two Copies.*
 John Lewis Paulhan, Esq.
 Rev. Richard Price, D.D. F.R.S. *Newington-Green,*
Ten Copies.
 Rev. Joseph Priestly, L.L.D. F.R.S. *Calne.*
 Rev. John Palmer, *Macclesfield.*
 Rev. Benjamin Peckford, *Exeter.*
 Mrs. Palmer, *Two Copies.*
 Mr. Joseph Partidge, *Taunton.*
 Mr. John Phelps, *Bridgewater.*
 Mr. John Pyke, *Coomb, near Chard.*
 Mr. John Warner Phipps, *London.*
 Mr. Robert Pine, *Maidstone.*
 Mr. Thomas Pine, *Ditto.*
 Mr. John Pine, *Ditto.*
 Mrs. Mary Pine, *Ditto.*
 Mr. George Prentis, *Ditto.*
 Mr. John Priestly, *Hallifax.*
 Mr. James Plank, *Wandsworth.*
 Mr. Richard Peyton, *London.*
 Mr. James Pearson, *Ditto.*
 Mr. James Parson, *Salisbury.*

Philalethes, *Portsmouth Dock Yard,*

R.

Richard Reynolds, Esq. *Paxton, Huntingdonshire.*
 Rev. ——— Robertson, D. D. *Wolverhampton.*
 Rev. Abraham Rees, D. D. *Tutor in the Academy at Hoxton.*
 Rev. John Reynel, *Totness.*
 Rev. Thomas Rees, *Chertsey.*
 Rev. James Rowland, *Moreton, Hampstead.*
 Rev. Robert Robinson, *Cambridge.*
 Rev. Mr. Rawlin, *Ashburn.*
 Rev. Mr. Ralph, *Hallifax.*
 Mr. Richard Rhydero, *Carmarthen.*
 Mr. Christopher Rawdon, *Hallifax.*
 Mr. William Ruffel, *Birmingham.*
 Mr. Jeremiah Ridout, *London.*
 Mr. Romans, *York.*
 Regulus, *Portsmouth.*

S.

The Right Honourable the Earl of Shelburne.
 Robert Smith, Esq. *London.*
 Samuel Sparrow, Esq.
 Samuel Shore, Esq. *Norton, Two Copies.*
 John Stephens, Esq. *Exeter.*
 A. Swainson, M. D. *York.*
 Rev. Samuel Moreton Savage, D. D. *Tutor in the Academy at Hoxton.*
 Rev. Samuel Stennet, D. D. *London.*
 Rev. Isaac Smith, *Sidmouth.*
 Rev. William Sutton, *Epsom.*
 Rev. Benjamin Choyce Sowden, *Epsom.*
 Rev. John Sturch, *Newport in the Isle of Wight.*
 Rev. Mr. Scholefield, *Birmingham.*
 Mr. John Slade, *Colyton.*
 Lieut. Smith, of the 13th Regiment.

Mr.

Mr. Henry Smith, *Merchant, London, Two Copies.*
 Mr. William Seaman, *Attorney, Honiton.*
 Mr. George Shepherd, *Taunton.*
 Mr. Samuel Stuckey, *Langport, Three Copies.*
 Mr. George Stuckey, *Ditto.*
 Mrs. Stinton, *London.*
 Mr. Samuel Salte, *Ditto.*
 Mr. William Sharpe, *Newport in the Isle of Wight.*
 Mr. Robert Swaine, *Hallifax.*
 Mr. Abel Smith, *Ditto.*
 Mr. Sturch, *London.*
 Mr. Seagrave, *Attorney, at Nottingham,*
 T. S.
 Mr. Shirland Swanston.
 Mr. Sargent, *Halsted-Place, Kent.*

T.

Rajah of Tanjour.
 William Toogood, Esq. *Sherborn.*
 William Tucket, Esq. *Bridgewater.*
 Rev. Charles Toogood, *Sherborn.*
 Rev. Josiah Thompson, *London.*
 Rev. Joseph Towers, *Ditto.*
 Rev. William Turner, *Wakefield, Two Copies.*
 Rev. Mr. Tillard, *Vicar of South-Leverton.*
 Mrs. Totterdale, *Taunton.*
 Mr. George Taylor, *Bridgewater.*
 Mr. Joseph Taylor, *London.*
 Mr. Matthew Towgood, *Banker, Ditto.*
 Mr. John Towgood, *Ditto.*
 Mr. Isaac Thompson, *Merchant, Ditto.*
 Mr. Henry Tabraham, *Lenham.*

V.

Mr. William Vaughan, *London.*

Mr.

Mr. Benjamin Vaughan, *London.*

Mr. Thomas Viney, *Tenterden.*

Mr. John Vowell, *Sherborn.*

W.

Harry Webb, Esq. *London, Three Copies.*

Simon Wellman, Esq. *Yard, near Taunton.*

Thomas Watson, Esq. *Barrister at Law.*

John Warren, M. D. *Taunton.*

John Wright, M. D. *Bristol.*

John Watkinson, M. D. *London.*

Rev. Edw. West, M. A. *Vicar of Bradford and Clifton, Dorset.*

Rev. John Ward, *Taunton.*

Rev. George Waters, *Bridport, Three Copies.*

Rev. William Willets, *Newcastle Under-Line.*

Rev. Mr. Wood, *Leeds, Three Copies.*

Rev. John Wiche, *Maidstone.*

Rev. Thomas Watson, *Bridgewater.*

Rev. Benjamin Williams, *Salisbury.*

Rev. Mr. Williams, *Nottingham.*

Rev. Mr. Whittel, *York.*

Mr. Henry Wansey, *Salisbury.*

Mr. George Warry, *Attorney, at Chard.*

Mr. Robert Waller, *Surgeon, Gosport.*

Mr. Richard Wilkinson, *Chesterfield.*

Mr. Ebenezer Woods, *Salisbury.*

Mr. William Waller, *Liverpool.*

Mr. John Wood, *Reading.*

Mr. James Walder, *Cuckfield, Two Copies.*

Y.

Robert Yates, Esq. *Ebford, near Topsham.*

Rev. William Youatt, *Dulverton.*

Anonymous, *Twenty-Four Copies.*

THE INTRODUCTION.

THE light which broke out upon the intellectual and religious world at the reformation, soon diffused its beams to Poland. For the doctrine of Luther was carried into that country by some of his disciples in the year 1522, and about the same time by other followers of this great man into the neighbouring regions.

But that spirit of enquiry, to which the reformation from Popery was partly owing, did not confine itself merely to the examination of those doctrines and inventions, by which the Church of Rome had so cruelly abused the appearance of nature and Christianity.

It appeared to inquisitive minds that the peculiar teniments and practices of Popery which it was the duty of the faithful to reject, exposed and discarded, formed only a part, though the worst part, of those corruptions by which Christianity

THE INTRODUCTION.

TH E light, which broke out upon the intellectual and religious world at the reformation, soon diffused its beams to *Poland*. For the doctrine of LUTHER was carried into that country by some of his disciples in the year 1522, and about the same time by other followers of this great man into the neighbouring regions.

But that spirit of enquiry, to which the reformation from Popery was partly owing, did not confine itself merely to the examination of those doctrines and inventions, by which the Church of *Rome* had so entirely altered the appearance of nature and Christianity.

It appeared to inquisitive minds that the peculiar sentiments and practices of Popery which it was the design of the first reformers to refute, expose and discard, formed only a part, though the worst part of those corruptions by which Christianity
had

had been defaced, its beauty concealed, and its energy enervated. The perusal of the Scriptures opened a far different view of the religion of JESUS CHRIST, than what had been exhibited in the Creed of the Church and the decrees of councils: and Ecclesiastical history assisted them to trace out the rise and progress of those various opinions and customs, which had at length been formed into a regular system, established by authority and embraced throughout *Europe*.

A disposition for religious enquiries being awakened, and men having in some degree ventured to doubt, to examine and to deny particular opinions long held sacred, and long enforced by all the terrors of ecclesiastical tyranny; doubts naturally arose on other points, and feeling an independence of mind of which in the dark periods of spiritual thralldom they had been scarcely conscious, many pursued their investigations much farther than LUTHER, CALVIN and their disciples had carried theirs.

Assemblies appear to have been held at *Vicenza*, in the government of *Venice* in the year 1546 by persons, who formed themselves into associations to debate with freedom on various points of theology, and to deliberate concerning a general reformation of the commonly received systems of religion: they

they particularly discussed the truth of the common doctrine concerning the Trinity. These meetings were interrupted by the vigilance of Popish emissaries; some of their members seized and put to death; and the rest, through fear of persecution, fled, and dispersed themselves through different countries.

The principal of these was LÆLIUS SOCINUS, of *Siena*, the uncle of FAUSTUS; who, after having spent, as a voluntary exile, several years at *Zurich*, in 1551 went to *Poland*, which country he visited a second time in 1558. Here he instilled sentiments contrary to the common opinions into the mind of FRANCIS LISMANINUS, who was Preacher and Confessor to BONA SFORTIA, the wife of SIGISMUND I. King of *Poland*.

This LISMANINUS wrote and published several pieces on the doctrine of the Trinity, with a design to prove the Supremacy of the Father, as the origin and fountain of the divinity of the Son; which gave occasion to GREGORY PAUL, Minister of a PROTESTANT Church at *Cracow*, more openly and boldly to assert the same opinion.

About the same time that LÆLIUS SOCINUS came into *Poland*, a person from the *Low Countries*,
 b whose

whose name was SPIRITUS, arrived there: who happening, in the company of some friends, to take up a book in which were prayers distinctly addressed to the three divine persons, started this question, *Whether there are three Gods?* The question being fully discussed, doubts arose in the minds of some, especially in ANDREAS FRICIUS MODREVIUS, Secretary to the King. At the desire of this prince, who was of an inquisitive temper, FRICIUS studied the questions then agitated on the doctrine of the the Trinity, and wrote some books in favour of the UNITARIAN scheme, entitled *Sylva*.

In the year 1556, PETER GONEZIUS, a Pole, and a native of *Podlachia*, after his return from his travels into his own country, avowed, in the Synod of *Seceminum*, his approbation of the Apostles Creed, but his rejection of the *Nicene* and *Athanasian*, his denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, and his belief of the inferiority of the Son. He made the same declarations afterwards at *Breslia*, in 1558.

In the year 1558 there came to *Pinczow* GEORGE BUANDRATA, who then embraced, it is said, the sentiments of SERVETUS* on the Supremacy of the Father.

* SANDIUS says, there fell into his hands a copy of CALVIN'S Commentaries; which had been given by LIS-
MANINUS

Father. He met here with GONEZIUS, and STAN-
CARUS, an *Italian*, of his opinion on the point.
These persons held disputations with one another
and with others. A Synod was called for compo-
sing the controversies, at which were present many
ministers and nobles. This Synod was dissolved,
after it had held for some days, without any thing
being agreed upon; but it contributed much to the
overthrow of the common doctrine of the Trinity.

The same doctrine became the principal subject
of debate at succeeding Synods, held at different
places; and, at each, new advocates for the UNI-
TARIAN sentiments rose up. And, on the other
hand, there were others who opposed these new
opinions, and exerted their influence to check their
progress, and to support the belief of the common-
ly received notions. At one, in particular, sum-
moned at *Cracow*, 1561, letters were produced from
CALVIN, exhorting them to be on their guard
against BLANDRATA.

b a

At

MANINUS to GEORGE SCHOMAN, a Minister at *Pinczow*,
with some M. S. notes of LISMANINUS in the margin.
Among the rest, upon ACTS xx. 28. where CALVIN calls
SERVETUS *Hispanicum canem*, there was this distich:

*Cur tibi sum CALVINE canis? tuus efficit ardor,
Ne canis, heu! dicar, sed miserranda cinis.*

SANDII, *Biblioth. ANTITRIN.* p. 35;

At length, in 1565, as the diffensions on this head became more violent and more universal, GREGORY PAUL, with the approbation and countenance of some persons of eminent rank and dignity, attempted to restore the peace of the Church by addressing the assemblies of the kingdom at that time convened, and desiring a friendly conference on the questions.

This was obtained, and lasted for some days: but, when the authority of the *Fathers* was alledged in defence of the common opinion, before GREGORY PAUL had returned the answer he promised, in the absence of the other party, the more powerful party and popular sentiments prevailing, it was concluded no future controversies should be held with the UNITARIANS on these subjects. This produced an open schism, and the reformed Church was divided into two parties: into the greater Church, professing a Trinity of persons in the divine Being, and the lesser, holding the Unity of his person. The former esteemed it unlawful to communicate with the latter, and instigated the Popes and their Bishops to treat the weaker party as ARIAN blasphemers, and some of the nobility, who patronized them, were calumniated as guilty of treason against their country.

There was by no means a perfect Uniformity in the sentiments of these UNITARIANS concerning the

the nature and character of CHRIST. Some adopted the ARIAN notions, and these were called FARNOVIANs, from STANISLAUS FARNOVIVS or FARNESIUS, who presided over a Church and celebrated school at *Sandecia*. Others were denominated BUDNEIANs, from SIMON BUDNÆUS, a man of considerable acuteness and sagacity. Their opinion was, that JESUS CHRIST was born in the ordinary way, according to the general law of nature, and that he was no proper object of divine worship and adoration. A third part held those views and opinions on these subjects which were afterwards called SOCINIAN.

The UNITARIANs entertained different sentiments likewise on other points. They were not all agreed on the *Personality* of the *Holy Ghost*, nor in their explanation of the rules of conduct that were obligatory on CHRISTIANs. And most of them appeared to have denied the divine authority of *Infant-Baptism*.

From *Poland* the UNITARIAN sentiments were spread into *Transylvania*, and were embraced by SIGISMUND the sovereign of that country. Here they, who asserted that the Father alone was the most high God, were first called UNITARIANs. This prince granted them the free exercise of their religion, and

invited BLANDRATA, the physician, to his court. He brought with him FRANCIS DAVID, whose name will frequently occur in the following work, and who became Superintendent of the ANTITRINITARIAN societies in that kingdom. About the same time the states of *Poland* entered into an agreement, called *Pacta Conventa*, by which their Kings were bound to subscribe and make oath they would maintain universal Toleration.

The UNITARIANS of *Poland* were first called PINCZOVIANs, from the town *Pinczow*, in which the heads of this party of PROTESTANTS resided, and where they were protected and favoured by a person of illustrious rank. Flourishing societies of them were also formed at *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Luck*, *Sprila*, and in the city of *Racow*: at which last place JOHN SIENIENIUS, Palatine of *Podolia*, afforded his protection, joined himself to them, and erected for their use a School and Printing-office. *Racow*, by this means, became the center of their community, and from this town they derived the name of RACOVIANs.

These privileges were granted them about the year 1600, some time after SOCINUS came to *Poland*. Thus this country had the honour of carrying the Reformation to a degree of perfection it did not

not arrive at in any other kingdom for almost two centuries; as here were formed and erected the first Churches, where public worship was conducted on a plan agreeable to the simplicity of the Gospel, and their prayers directed to God the Father only, through JESUS CHRIST as the Mediator.

The preceding part of this narrative shews the state of religious enquiry previous to the appearance of FAUSTUS SOCINUS in that country. The circumstances of things were certainly favourable to his wishes and designs: there he found in some measure an asylum, and at least was associated with those who, having already doubted or rejected the doctrine of the TRINITY, were previously disposed for attending to his investigation of that and other subjects of religious enquiry. There is no doubt but their system received from his pen and labours great alterations: and his eminent virtues and singular abilities rendered him a very valuable acquisition to the UNITARIAN cause*.

Among the names of the persons whom we mentioned above, as, by their enquiries and disquisitions, preparing

The authorities for the abovementioned facts may be seen in SANDII, *Biblioth. ANTITR.* p. 18, 19, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 183, 188, 209, 216, 269. MOSHEIM's *Eccles. Hist. Cent. 16. sect. 3. part 2. chap. 4.*

preparing the way for Socinus's labours, was Lælius Socinus. Some more particular account of this distinguished person should be subjoined here, as from him Faustus received the first hints of those religious sentiments he afterwards delivered to the Unitarian Brethren in *Poland* and *Transylvania*.

Lælius was the son of Marianus, a famous lawyer. He was devoted by his father to the study of the law, a study almost hereditary in the family; and, supposing that the knowledge of human laws might be drawn from an acquaintance with the divine laws, and be traced back to them as their fountain, he carefully examined, with this view, the sacred Scriptures. In the course of his enquiries, he discovered that many of the doctrines of the Church, which were commonly maintained, were contrary to Revelation. This gave him less surprize, as most of them were repugnant to common sense and the principles of natural reason. There was united in him, with a soaring mind and acute genius, a peculiar probity of heart: by this he was preserved from falling into a contempt of the Scriptures and Religion, in consequence of detecting the errors of the Church, which is often the case. His skill in the *Arabic*, *Hebrew* and *Greek* languages, particularly qualified him for investigating the sense of Scripture,

Whether

Whether it arose from fear of danger, or from a desire of attaining the knowledge of a purer theology, at the age of twenty one he left *Italy*, in 1547, and passed four years in visiting *France*, *Holland*, *Germany* and *Poland*: at last he fixed his residence at *Zurich*, in *Switzerland*, and, though he was often absent from this place on account of private and public concerns, yet he spent the greatest part of his voluntary exile here. He enjoyed the favour of persons of the highest rank in different countries and the friendship of some kings. His amiable manners, his judgment, sweetness of temper, and prudence of conduct, merited the friendship and secured him an intimacy with all the men of eminent learning in those times. MELANCTHON not only passed the highest encomiums on him in the letters he wrote him, but used his influence with the Emperor MAXIMILIAN II. and SIGISMUND the King of *Poland*, to invest him with the character of their Ambassador to the *Venetians*: by which means he enjoyed a safe access to his paternal inheritance, to take possession of it and to regulate his affairs. He held a familiar correspondence with CALVIN, BULLINGER, BRENT, MUSCULUS, MUNSTER, ZANCHY, VERGERIUS, CASTALIO, BEZA, MARTYR, OCHINUS, CÆLIUS, and many others. He was more desirous of converting the friendship of these persons to the benefit of the Church than to the

the security of his own fortune; and therefore urged those patrons of the common theology with doubts and questions, by which he drew on himself strong suspicions of heresy. There is a letter of CALVIN's, in particular, in which he could not disguise his resentment, and instead of an answer returned angry reflections and threats.

“ You must not expect, says he, that I should
 “ answer your shocking questions. If you choose
 “ to soar among such airy speculations, leave me,
 “ I beg you, like an humble disciple of CHRIST,
 “ to meditate on those things which will tend to the
 “ confirmation of my faith: and I will, by my si-
 “ lence obtain my desire, and prevent your solici-
 “ tations on these heads for the future. It greatly
 “ grieves me that the fine parts GOD hath given
 “ you should not only be employed in things vain
 “ and useless, but in pernicious fictions. I again
 “ seriously warn you of what I have before declared,
 “ that, unless you correct in season this luxurious
 “ inquisitiveness, it is to be feared you will bring
 “ on yourself heavy calamities. I should be per-
 “ fidious and cruel, if, under the mask of tender-
 “ ness, I indulged what appears to me a most hurt-
 “ ful vice: I had rather therefore you should be a
 “ little displeased with my harshness, than not re-
 “ claimed from the curiosity which flatters and be-
 “ witches

"witches you. The time I hope will come, when
 "you will be glad you were so roughly awakened.

"Calends of JAN. 1552.

Your

"JOHN CALVIN."

These threats were not merely expressions of a transient resentment, which might be safely treated with neglect: for, in *October* of the next year, *SERVETUS* was burnt at *Geneva*. Yet the respect in which the character of *LÆLIUS* was held, the uncommon modesty with which his distinguished parts and learning were veiled, and the prudence of his deportment, disarmed the rage of his enemies*, and he lived without the least molestation amongst the severest enemies to his opinions. Yet he did not conceal in his own breast his sentiments, but communicated his thoughts to those in whose friendship he

* *Sciant, quos, nimia veri libertas in pericula sæpe intempestiva præcipitat, ipsam illam, quam propugnant, veritatem in circumspecta prudentiæ lenitate, quam in effreni zelo plus habere præsidii. Ut quis ultro suis discriminibus, magis ad privatam laudem quam ad publici emolumenti rationem festinare videatur. Et si usquam alibi, hic profecto, columbina simplicitas serpentino astu temperanda est: nisi nobis suspectum est Servatoris concilium damnantis eorum inconsultam temeritatem, quibus sæpe nequiter expetit, suas illic margaritas prodigere, ubi pretio suo æstimari nequeunt.* This is the reflection of *PRZIPCOWIUS* on the conduct of *LÆLIUS*. *SOCINI Opera*, T. i. p. 10,

he could confide; as in particular to his countrymen, whom a pious and voluntary exile had dispersed through *Germany* and *Poland*, to some other learned men of judgment and probity, and by letters to his own relations.

A premature death removed LÆLIUS from our world in the 37th year of his age. He died at *Zurich*, May, 1562.

After the UNITARIANS had been formed into distinct and separate societies, they held Assemblies and Synods among themselves. As frequent mention of these associations will occur in the following pages, this seems the proper place to give a particular account of them. The Synods were yearly or more frequent conventions of the Ministers, Elders and Deacons of the UNITARIAN Churches through *Poland* and the neighbouring regions. The leading design of them was to provide for the external and internal prosperity and government of their ecclesiastical state. The first thing they did was to choose, by common suffrage, two Moderators of the Synod, one from the ministers, the other from the laity, who should preside in the assembly, propose the points to be settled, and take care that all things should be done decently and in order. Then were read the letters from private persons, or

the

the patrons of their Churches, or absent ministers: which generally supplied some subject for deliberation, and to which the Synod, after various consultations, returned an answer.

In these Synods they deliberated concerning the preservation of the societies already subsisting, the forming of new Churches, and the propagation of their principles in other provinces, and particularly about an union with the CALVINISTS and MEMNONITES, or ANABAPTISTS. In them the removals of Ministers were settled: Pastors were assigned to particular Churches, and the same were consecrated to their office by solemn exhortations. An enquiry was made into the morals of ministers, how they discharged the duties of their character, and whether discipline was maintained by the Pastors, Elders and Deacons. Private Tutors of the nobles were appointed, and Professors for their public academies; the care of which was entrusted to Presidents, who were to examine into the learning and morals of the Professors and Students, and to make reports of the same to the Synod.

The affairs, which were too intricate or weighty to be settled in their separate Churches, were examined and determined upon in these assemblies. The direction of the public Treasury, to which every

every one contributed according to his ability, formed a part of this business. The Synod assigned from it salaries and exhibitions to Ministers, to Rectors of their academies and their assistants, to those who filled some public station, and to pupils educated by unanimous consent and at the expence of the Church, for the office of Ministers or Tutors. It farther made a provision for the support of widows and orphans, especially those of the Ministers who had deserved well of this sect; and also for aged ministers. It likewise granted relief to exiles and foreigners well affected to UNITARIAN principles, and reduced to want through losses sustained by fire, plundering, or captivity. Here they deliberated about the composing, correcting, printing and publishing of books, either with the general approbation or at the public charge, for the benefit of their Churches: and likewise of sending suitable persons, as missionaries, into distant countries, to disseminate their principles. General Deacons laid before the Synod accounts of the sums expended or wanted, either for the whole community or for particular Churches: and a report was made how much each Church sent towards the public expences. Lastly, at these meetings the Lord's-Supper was celebrated, and new converts were admitted into the Church by Baptism;

The

The Acts and Resolutions of these Synods are now in existence. They are M.S. written chiefly in the *Polish* language, with an intermixture of *Latin* words and phrases. The decrees of the Synods held from the year 1555 to 1607 are contained in a volume of an octavo size: those of the Synods from 1607 fill two volumes of a larger form.

These Acts of their general assemblies are in the hands of the SOCINIANS in *Prussia*, on the borders of *Poland*; and liberty to inspect and peruse them is not easily obtained. During the flourishing state of the SOCINIANS in *Poland*, these papers were very carefully kept from the sight of others. In a Synod held at *Racow*, in 1650, an exact obedience to the general resolutions of the assembly was recommended to every Minister, and it was resolved, that they should be transcribed for each at his own expence. To this end, MORSZOVIVS delivered a copy of them, that more might be taken from it. At the same time, it was solemnly enjoined him and the other Ministers, not to communicate them to such as were not of their communion, and not easily grant any one permission to handle them*.

THE

* FRED. SAM. BOCK, Hist. ANTITRIN. Tom. i. pars 1. p. 1—7. *Regiomonti & Lipsiæ*, 1774.

The Acts and Resolutions of these Synods are now in existence. They are M.S. written chiefly in the Polish language, with an intermixture of Latin words and phrases. The decrees of the Synods held from the year 1555 to 1607 are contained in a volume of an octavo size: those of the Synods from 1607 till two volumes of a larger form.

These Acts of their general assemblies are in the hands of the Secretaries in Poland, on the borders of Poland; and liberty to inspect and peruse them is not easily obtained. During the flourishing state of the Secretaries in Poland, these papers were very carefully kept from the sight of others. In a Synod held at Racow, in 1680, an exact obedience to the general resolutions of the assembly was recommended to every Minister, and it was resolved, that they should be transcribed for each at his own expence. To this end, Morawski delivered a copy of them, that more might be taken from it. At the same time, it was solemnly enjoined him and the other Ministers not to communicate them to such as were not of their communion, and not easily grant any one permission to handle them.

FRID. SAM. BUCK, Hist. Antiquar. Tom. I. pars. 1.
p. 1-7. Rycerzowi & Sypniewski.

THE
L I F E
O F
FAUSTUS SOCINUS.

CHAPTER I.

A Narrative of his Birth, and the principal Incidents of his Life.

FAUSTUS SOCINUS was born on the 6th of *December*, 1539, at *Siena*, a celebrated City of *Tuscany* in *Italy*. He was descended from an ancient and noble Family, and was related to many Persons of illustrious rank and distinguished learning. His Father was ALEXANDER SOCINUS, in whom were joined, to an extraordinary

B

ordinary force of Genius, a most retentive Memory and persuasive Eloquence. This ALEXANDER SOCINUS was honoured with a Diploma by the University of *Siena*, in the year 1530, conferring on him the Degree of Doctor of the civil and canon Law; was soon after made Professor in Ordinary in the University of *Padua*, and died in the thirty-first year of his age, regretted by all *Italy*. The Mother of FAUSTUS was AGNES, the daughter of BURGESIUS PETRUCCII (Chief of the Republic of *Siena*) and VICTORIA PICCOLIMINI, a Lady of singular Merit and Virtue, who instilled into her Daughter's Mind the purest and noblest sentiments.

FAUSTUS SOCINUS lost his Parents in his early years, a Period most susceptible of the improvements and cultivation of Learning. It was matter of painful Recollection to him, that he had applied himself very little to the pursuits of Literature, and never enjoyed the assistance of a Tutor. He owned that he had not studied Philosophy, was a stranger to the Divinity of the Schools, and that his acquaintance in Logic extended no farther than to the Rudiments of it, and this knowledge he had gained but late in life. “What accuracy of judgment in the
“ difficult points of philosophical and theological
“ Disputes (says he to a friend) can be expected
“ from

“ from me, who never learnt Philosophy, nor ever
 “ touched upon what they call Scholastic Divi-
 “ nity; and as to Logic have only had a taste of
 “ some of the *Rudiments of it*, and that very late
 “ in life. You should know that most of my po-
 “ lemicall Pieces were written before I had applied
 “ to the study of this Art. Such are my Books
 “ DE SERVATORE, against PUCCIUS, against PA-
 “ LÆOLOGUS, against FRANCIS DAVID, on *Bap-*
 “ *tism*, on the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the
 “ ROMANS, the Answer to VOLANUS, the Ani-
 “ madversions on the POSNANIAN THESES con-
 “ cerning the TRI-UNE GOD, and some unfinished
 “ Pieces: So that, after this, you cannot wonder
 “ if you discover many things not accurately ex-
 “ pressed, nor conclusive *.”

His Biographer remarks on these disadvantages
 in his education, that it was a rebuke to that proud
 age to be taught by so remarkable an instance, that
 there may be great men and glorious examples
 without those helps, which, though with reason we
 commend, yet we often immoderately admire †.
 The first part of SOCINUS's life, till he was twenty-
 three, was employed in obtaining this small stock
 of Learning, and in the study of Jurisprudence.

B 2 He

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 490. col. 1.

† Vitam Soc, Oper. tom. i. p. 3.

He had, indeed, in the mean time, through the strength of his own Genius, and the instructions of his Uncle LÆLIUS, imbibed some Principles of religious Knowledge, and of the Sentiments he afterwards professed. LÆLIUS entertained great confidence in the mental powers of his Nephew, and expressed among his friends great hopes that his own Opinions would be fully and successfully laid before the world by FAUSTUS: though the questions on which he had refused to satisfy him were more than those on which he had instructed him, and some points he had entirely left to be discovered by the penetration of the youth.

SOCINUS spent the first twenty years of his life, and, after a short interval, twelve years more in his own country. He resided for the space of three years in *Switzerland*, and the rest of his days, a period of thirty years, were passed in voluntary exile. He spent some little time with his Uncle in *France*, and upon LÆLIUS's death returned into *Italy*; and having formed an acquaintance with the GRAND DUKE of *Tuscany*, he lived twelve years in his Court, discharged the most honourable employments there, and was eminently distinguished by the favour of the Prince and the dignities conferred on him.

At the end of this term he entered into a serious consideration of the value of the different objects that solicit the attention of men, and into sober reflections on the true End and highest Happiness of his Being. The result of these reflections was a firm conviction, that the richest and greatest earthly prospects were to be despised for the Hope of heavenly Glory and Felicity. He voluntarily left his own Country, his Friends, his Hopes, and his Wealth; that he might be the more disengaged, to seek his own Salvation and that of others.

In the year 1574, and in the thirty-fifth of his age, he went from *Italy* into *Germany*. He resided at first for three years in *Basil*, a city upon the *Rhine*, a town famous for affording in those times an hospitable *asylum* to those who were *Exiles* and *Sufferers* for *CHRIST*. He employed this whole space in the study of *Theology*, joining to a perusal of the sacred Volumes his fervent and daily Prayers to be led to a true Understanding of them: and he was assisted in these enquiries by the writings and notes of his Uncle.

He continued at *Basil* to anno 1577, when he began to throw off all reserve and disguise as to his religious Opinions; for regarding them as the Truths of *GOD*, he thought it a crime to conceal

them in his own breast. Acting on this principle, and desirous to diffuse around him the Light which had been, in his apprehensions, poured in upon his own mind, he insensibly proceeded from holding free conversations with his friends on religious points, to debates with others. He entered into a dispute concerning the Office of JESUS CHRIST as our Saviour, first a verbal and afterwards a written one. Before this was finished, his health obliged him to desist from his studies, and being debarred the use of his papers, which were left at *Basil*, by a plague there, he in the mean time terminated at *Zurich* another dispute with FRANCIS PUCCIUS, in the beginning of the year 1578. In the same year he returned to *Basil*, and put the last hand to his Book DE SERVATORE.

About the same time, the opinion of FRANCIS DAVID and some others, relative to the honour and power of CHRIST, produced great disturbances and commotions in the ANTI-TRINITARIAN Churches in *Transylvania*. With a view to provide a remedy for this evil, GEORGE BLANDRATA, a Gentleman who had great influence in those Churches and with those who possessed the supreme authority in the State, invited SOCINUS from *Basil* in the same year, that he might draw off FRANCIS DAVID, the head of the party, from his peculiar

liar Sentiments. More conveniently and agreeably to effect this end, BLANDRATA, at his own expence, discharged the board of SOCINUS in FRANCIS' house, that they might enjoy the advantages of the same place of residence and the same table, which they did for three quarters of a year. But the good design failed of its desired success; for, neither satisfied, nor affected by the reasonings of SOCINUS, FRANCIS DAVID not only retained his opinions, and privately propagated them, but publicly advanced them from the Pulpit; and for this was thrown into prison by the Prince of *Transylvania*, where he soon after died.

When this conference was ended, and had been laid before the *Transylvanian* Churches in May, 1579, a disease that greatly prevailed there, called the Cholic, constrained SOCINUS to leave those parts. In the same year, being then forty, he repaired to *Poland*, where he was very desirous of being publicly joined to the UNITARIAN Churches; but because he did not conceal his difference from them in some points, he met with a severe and long repulse. About this period, by his frequent disputations and writings, in what he judged the cause of GOD and TRUTH, he irritated many against him, who accused him to the King, and represented that it would be a reflection on his Government to suffer

the Author, whom they invidiously stiled an *Italian Vagrant* and Exile, to go unpunished. Upon this he left *Cracow*, and retired to the seat of CHRISTOPHER MORSTINIUS, a *Polish Nobleman*, and Lord of *Pawlikovi*, where his innocence was protected, not by secrecy, but by the privilege of the Nobility of *Poland**. This country-seat was only a few miles from *Cracow*; a situation which promised to afford much better advantages for his vindication than a prison.

This benevolent Nobleman not only opened his hospitable doors for the entertainment of SOCINUS, at that season of danger; but kindly supported him for more than three years. Indeed he loaded this Exile and Foreigner with greater and more remarkable tokens of humanity and respect: for a little after he married his daughter to him, and of a guest made him his son, and in all human views established his safety by such noble connections and alliances†. The issue of this marriage was a daughter, named AGNES, who was born about *Whitsuntide*, 1587. In

* The Nobles of *Poland* enjoyed the greatest privileges, and in their own Districts and Palatinates possessed almost an independent jurisdiction, and exercised nearly an absolute authority.

† For the Family of his Wife, see Vitam WITSO-WATII, apud SANDIUM, p. 224.

In *September* of the same year, he lost his wife. His grief under so severe a stroke *, with which he was affected and overpowered to so great a degree, that he thought few others ever felt the same, was followed by a dangerous fit of illness, which was of so stubborn a nature, as for some months to interrupt his studies and designs: and, that nothing might be wanting to aggravate his distress, by the death of FRANCIS, the GRAND DUKE of *Tuscany*, he was deprived of the revenues arising from his estates in *Italy*, which had been remitted to him every year. Indeed some time before this, through the vehemence of his accusers and the threats of the POPE, he was in danger of losing his estate; but by the mediation of ISABELLA MEDICIS, Sister of the GRAND DUKE of *Tuscany*, during her life, and afterwards by the benevolence of her brother, as long as he survived, SOCINUS had his rents annually remitted. These Princes dying, whose friendship was so important to him, every thing conspired to distress him. His wife was torn from his embraces: his health and constitution impaired and weakened: his noble protectors and friends dead: his fortune and estates confiscated; and, in this distressed and exiled situation, the circumstances of the Government, where he had fixed his residence, added to his calamities: for there was then

* Opera, vol. i. p. 426, col. 1.

Then a great struggle between the competitors for the Crown of *Poland*: and these troublesome times favoured the licentiousness and malice of his enemies. For which reason he returned again to *Cracow*: and sought some consolation under these aggravated evils, in exerting his endeavours to purge away the errors which in his opinion then prevailed in the Church; an employment he thought assigned him by the Providence of God.

He had all along frequented the Ecclesiastical Assemblies. He went anno 1588 to a Synod in the borders of *Lithuania*, where he disputed with unusual vigour and success, concerning the Death and Sacrifice of CHRIST, Justification, and the Corruption of Human Nature; and with the adherents to FRANCIS DAVID and BUDNEUS on the Invocation of CHRIST.

Whilst he continued his residence at *Cracow*, the calamities, which generally attend those who faithfully adhere to the dictates of conscience, threatened him from every quarter; but especially was the enmity of many revived and heightened, after he published his Book DE SERVATORE. In the year 1598, when he was ill and confined to his chamber for the recovery of his health, the rabble instigated by the ACADEMICS, haled him out of his

his bed half naked, and with great indignities dragged him through the streets and market-place, crying out for a public punishment to be inflicted on him. At length by the interposition of M. VADOVITZ, Professor in the University of CRACOW, he was with great difficulty rescued from the fury of the mob. He was at this time plundered of his furniture, desks, and whatever the enraged vulgar could lay their hands on: but he regarded the loss of his goods as nothing, in comparison with that of his Manuscripts, amongst which was a valuable Work against the ATHEISTS; for he often declared, he would gladly recover his papers at the expence of his life.

As threats were now added to the evils he had suffered by the populace, he retired from *Cracow*, to a village at the distance of nine miles from that city, which was rendered famous by his abode and his death. Here he was entertained by ABRAHAM BLONSKI, a Gentleman of illustrious rank. In this situation he devoted his time to detect and confute every Doctrine he imagined to be false and erroneous, and to bring the Church in all points to an unanimous agreement. And having seen the success of his labours, as if his life had been protracted only to accomplish this purpose, at the latter end of winter, in his 65th year, he died,
anno

anno 1604. A death not so immature to himself, as it was lamented by his friends. His last words were, "That not less satiated with life than with the
 " enmity and calamities he had felt, he was expect-
 " ing, with joyful and undaunted hope, that last
 " moment, which would bring with it a release from
 " his trials and the recompence of his labours."

This Epitaph was inscribed on his Tomb:

Tota licet *Babylon* destruxit tecta LUTHERUS,
 Muros CALVINUS, sed fundamenta SOCINUS.

That is, LUTHER destroyed the houses of *Babylon*,
 CALVIN the walls, but SOCINUS subverted the
 foundations*.

To this view of the events which marked the life
 of SOCINUS, it will not be improper to add some
 account of the form of his body, and the powers
 of his mind.

SOCINUS was of a stature not exceeding a well-
 proportioned height, but rather tall and slender.
 The dignity of his high forehead and the manly
 expression and penetration of his eyes gave a grace
 to

* DICTIONNAIRE des HERESIES. Art. SOCINIANISME,
 p. 519.

to his countenance, which appeared full of vigour and majesty.

His Works are lasting monuments of the clearness of his Conceptions and the powers of his Genius. His Learning, though attained late in life, was valuable and solid, and broke out through all his endeavours to conceal it. His Memory was remarkably tenacious, a striking instance of which was furnished by his management of a Disputation he held with CHRISTIANUS FRANKEN.

This man, in a particular Synod, fond of making an ostentatious display of his learning and parts, challenged, with a very unbecoming superciliousness, any of the Ministers present to enter the lists with him, expressing an unreserved contempt of their erudition and capacity. That he might, by a multitude of arguments, confound and bear down any one who would dispute with him, he formed no less than fifty reasons in a continued chain, which he had premeditated, against the Invocation of CHRIST. This bold challenge made some uneasy, and they assigned the part of answering him to SOCINUS, though he had been so often rejected from the Communion of the Church. FRANKEN had so suddenly and unfairly entered on the dispute, and did as it were with the same bow pour out so many pre-

prepared shafts, that SOCINUS, though he listened to him with attention, was advised to minute the heads of the arguments to which he was to reply. But, trusting to his memory, he slighted the assistance of his pen; and having patiently heard FRANKEN producing his reasons as long as he pleased, he immediately answered each reason distinctly, in the order in which they were pronounced, so solidly and fully, till he had gone through the whole series, that his adversary was silenced, and not being able to retort one word, was obliged to plead he was not properly furnished and prepared on the subject; and to the amazement of the whole Synod, withdrew in evident confusion.

SOCINUS left one child, a Daughter; whose birth we have noticed before. I find him making mention of her in one place. “ I am not solicitous about my Daughter, except that where she is now, she has, I apprehend, too much leisure, and is not sufficiently engaged in the learning and Practice of what becomes a Christian girl, or at least but seldom and carelessly. Yet I have not been able for some time to know any thing certain on the point, and it would be difficult for me to take her from her Aunt*.” She was married after her Father’s death to STANISLAUS

* Opera, tom, 1. p. 473. col. 1.

SLAUS WITZOWATIUS, a Polonian Knight, and died at *Robcovia*, anno 1654, on the 20th of *January*. She expired in the house of her Son, ANDREAS WITSOWATIUS, a Pastor in the UNITARIAN Churches, distinguished by his piety, ministerial labours and sufferings. She expired, says the Historian, commending her spirit to the Saviour, and pouring out her warm and grateful benedictions on her Son, his Wife and Children, in return for the kindness with which she had been treated to the hour of her death*.

* Vide Vitam WISSOWATII, apud SANDIUM, p. 244.

“ Such and so considerable a Man, says a Writer
 “ against SOCINIANISM, was the Author and Patron
 “ of this Sect. All those qualities that excite the
 “ admiration and attract the regards of men, met in
 “ him : that, as it were with a charm, he bewitched
 “ all who conversed with him, and left on their minds
 “ strong impressions of wonder and affection towards
 “ him. He so excelled in fine parts and a lofty ge-
 “ nius, such were the strength of his reasonings and
 “ the power of his eloquence, he displayed in the
 “ sight of all so many distinguished virtues, which he
 “ either professed, or counterfeited in an extraordinary
 “ degree, that he appeared formed to engage the at-
 “ tachment of all mankind ; and it is not the least sur-
 “ prising that he deceived great numbers, and drew
 “ them over to his party. So that what AUGUSTIN
 “ said

“ said of FAUSTUS MANICHÆUS, may not improp-
 “ perly be applied to FAUSTUS SOCINUS, that he
 “ was, *Magnum Diaboli Laqueum*, the Devil’s Decoy.”

ASHWELL de SOCINO & SOCINIANISMO, p. 18.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER II.

The moral and religious Character of SOCINUS.

HAVING attended Socinus through the different scenes of his Life, I shall now endeavour to delineate his Character: a character which has suffered much from the pen of bigotry, and the prejudices of party, but is little known: the sensible and candid Reader, when he has taken a view of it, will probably be ready to confess it is truly great, and requires only to be known in order to be admired. The most striking features in this moral picture are Faith, Zeal, Moderation, and Self-government. A firm and supreme regard to Immortality appears to have been the leading motive of his actions, the animating spring of his conduct.—This awakened and kept alive his Zeal, which,

which, though superior to every difficulty and suffering, was tempered with the gentle influence of Catholicism and Moderation:—And this moderation was expressed not only with respect to points of religious debate, but in all the amiable virtues that are derived from a calm and habitual Self-government. To illustrate these branches of his Character we must appeal to the general facts of his Life—to some particular circumstances and incidents—and to the sentiments and spirit that strongly mark his Writings and Letters.

SECTION I.

The Firmness of his Faith, and his Attachment to Immortality.

THE life and labours of Socinus indicated a strong impression of the preference due to the promises of the Gospel, and to the hope of eternal life. He thought these motives ought to outweigh every consideration which the evils, or the interests of the present state could offer.

As a proof in what light the evidence and importance of a future State struck his mind, I will quote a passage from his Treatise on the Authority

rity of the Holy Scriptures. He there laments, that scarcely one person out of an hundred, who profess themselves Christians, studies probity of manners, from the motive by which they own CHRIST hath enjoined it. He says, “ It is needless to prove
 “ that this reason and motive, viz. Immortal Life
 “ attended with the highest and perpetual felicity,
 “ when compared with this life abounding with all
 “ worldly goods that can possibly be possessed or
 “ enjoyed, is only as some millions of pounds to
 “ one farthing: this any one may easily perceive;
 “ nay, this state of happiness far exceeds all comparison. Since between one farthing only and
 “ some millions of pounds there is some proportion, because they are both finite things; but
 “ between this mortal and that immortal life, between present temporary and future eternal objects, there is no measure or proportion: because
 “ this life and present objects are finite, and the
 “ others are infinite and unlimited in their duration.

“ There is no one who would not be deemed an idiot; if he did not instantly part with a farthing, as soon as he saw only a small probability, that he should gain by so trifling a deposit some millions of gold. So not any one in his right senses who has even a slight apprehension, that by depositing (if I may use the expression) all the ad-

“ advantages of this mortal life and life itself in obey-
 “ ing GOD, according to the precepts of JESUS of
 “ *Nazareth*, he shall secure another and an immor-
 “ tal life, attended with the highest and never-end-
 “ ing felicity (as must be the case if those things are
 “ true which the sacred Historians have related)
 “ would not immediately resolve to do it*.”

SOCINUS acted on such Principles. No one seems to have been better furnished with all those advantages, whereby men rise to fame, wealth, and the height of human wishes. A noble descent, illustrious friendships, the favour of Princes, a handsome estate, health, genius, eloquence, learning, and a capacious mind, lent him their joint assistance; as if Nature, Fortune and Application had vied with each other, in heaping on him their respective favours. But he sacrificed all, in obedience to what he regarded as the call of Providence, and the interest of Truth. Nay, as if the loss of all these distinctions, so flattering to human hopes, were a small matter; he willingly and designedly devoted himself as a victim to numerous distresses, to want, to dangers, to enmity, to universal contempt, to reproaches, and the odium of a memory every where the object of abhorrence. The truth

is,

* SOCINI de Author. *Sacræ Scripturæ*, cap. 4. vel *Opera*, tom. i. p. 276.

is, he did not expect any other reward at present. He carried his views beyond the bounds of this life, beyond the revolutions of time: his hope was so sincerely raised to Heaven that it relied on no spring of earthly comfort. The prospect of Immortality was his only incentive to every labour, his only solace under every suffering; severe as were those sufferings, and arduous as were those labours.

This hope he continually inculcated on the whole Church, as the sole antidote against every discouragement and difficulty in a life of holiness and virtue. He thought men should make the cherishing and improving this hope their business and pleasure, their care and delight. When a person, far advanced in years, shewed him a tomb he had built for himself, as a token of piety, and added, that his mind was continually engaged in meditations on Death: SOCINUS replied, “ He would have been
“ much better employed, if he had contemplated
“ the evidences and nature of the Resurrection of
“ the dead.”

It at once proves the sincerity and illustrates the power of SOCINUS's Faith; that such having been the evils he met, such the sacrifice he made; his situation was so destitute of all motives which address human pride and ambition, that it cannot be ea-

fily conceived, by what consideration he could be actuated, unless by a firm persuasion of a future state of rewards and a supreme attachment of Soul to Immortality. Here he seems to be distinguished above most sufferers in what they have esteemed the Cause of GOD and TRUTH, if he stand not alone.

“ I would not detract (says his Historian) from
 “ the praise due to the merits of others: let his
 “ own peculiar honour await each. But I might
 “ say, that though other illustrious Men have per-
 “ haps endeavoured to exhibit as sublime a pat-
 “ tern of faith, yet I know not whether any one
 “ attained it. For the generality were not desti-
 “ tute of such encouragements, as afforded to their
 “ virtue an immediate recompence, so that they
 “ were not long GOD's creditors. The magnani-
 “ mity of LUTHER and of others, was repayed with
 “ the applauses and attachments of Princes and
 “ nations. How many others, before poor and
 “ obscure, hath the defence of the Cause of GOD
 “ advanced to wealth and power? Yet their faith
 “ hath not lost its praise by this change of circum-
 “ stances, since the cause they espoused, and to
 “ which they were indebted for their advancement,
 “ grew and kept pace with their increasing reputa-
 “ tion. Neither let them be reckoned in this
 “ number

“ number, who, even with a great detriment to
 “ their fortune, embraced the Cause of GOD (i. e.
 “ what is truly such, or what they apprehended to
 “ be so) when it was flourishing and displayed its
 “ greatest influence. For some object of earthly
 “ recompence is placed in their view, even sepa-
 “ rately from a regard to Heaven: and in the
 “ expectation of such immediate rewards, it is not
 “ easy to discern whether they repose their confi-
 “ dence more on GOD, or their own activity. But
 “ as to LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS, men of solid judg-
 “ ment, who were well acquainted with the taste
 “ and temper of the age in which they lived, what
 “ solace from earth, either in their own times or
 “ the next age, could they promise themselves,
 “ amidst so many dangers and perils: when they
 “ professed Tenets which were recommended
 “ neither by the influence of authority, nor
 “ the countenance of parties, nor an indulgence
 “ to irregularities of life, nor by any other al-
 “ lurement; tenets, which on the contrary, their
 “ strictness and severity rendered disgusting and
 “ odious to all. I cannot see here the least room
 “ for the admission of earthly hopes into the mind,
 “ to detract from the honours of the noblest faith;
 “ which, truly great as it was, being denied in this
 “ world any objects on which to fix its expecta-
 “ tions,

“ tions, soared to Heaven, and reposed itself solely
 “ on the Goodness of GOD.

“ IGNATIUS, not to mention others, in the me-
 “ mory of our fathers, contemned his country, re-
 “ lations, wealth, honour, and every allurements,
 “ and voluntarily endured numerous labours and
 “ perils, from avowed zeal for the Divine Glory,
 “ and as engaging in the warfare of Faith. Far
 “ be it from me to despise the greatness of mind
 “ he and others discovered; for they walked to
 “ glory in no easy path. But none of these in-
 “ stances afford what we are seeking, an example
 “ of a Divine Faith. I do not pretend to pass
 “ sentence on the intentions of any man, neither
 “ is this necessary to the present question; it will
 “ be hereafter done by GOD the infallible Judge.
 “ Therefore I regard not what actually influenced
 “ the mind of IGNATIUS; it is sufficient to the
 “ point before us, to consider what inducements
 “ might probably offer themselves. It is true he
 “ saw that the affairs of the POPE, in some Pro-
 “ vinces, were in a disordered state, but he could
 “ not be ignorant that in many, or at least the more
 “ powerful ones, and consequently in his own
 “ country and that of his intended residence, they
 “ were in a firm and flourishing situation. Who
 “ can

“ can assert that he was not apprized of the immense
 “ rewards instantly conferred by that Church on its
 “ advocates? It is certain that generous minds
 “ are most sensible of the spur of glory.

“ Where ever the fair field of honour opens to
 “ view, men despise not only pleasures and wealth,
 “ but make no account even of life. Therefore
 “ martyrdom is easily endured, in the cause of a
 “ rich and prosperous Church, without any great
 “ exercise of a Divine Faith, and deserves no
 “ higher admiration than the conduct of the brave
 “ youth who fought at *Cannæ* and *Trebia*, who
 “ were born for the *Punic* times; or, if military al-
 “ lusions displease, than that of *Codrus*, who was
 “ not afraid to die for his country. And there is
 “ no doubt, who ever wished to eternize his name
 “ in the Church of *Rome*, wisely chose the course
 “ for glory. For the ancient *Roman* Republic
 “ (though by such means chiefly advanced to its
 “ greatness) did never propose so many and such
 “ distinguished rewards for sufferings and dangers
 “ in its interest, as the *Roman* Church holds forth.
 “ The sumptuous Couches and sacred Altars, were
 “ late inventions to flatter the Emperors. Whereas
 “ the Church, to all that deserve well of her, be-
 “ sides a Name had in everlasting veneration, of-
 “ fers the founding of Religious Orders, Temples,
 “ and

“ and an honourable rank among her canonized
 “ Saints. To what nobler heights can the most ar-
 “ dent thirst for glory aspire? When therefore
 “ such envied recompences are proposed and
 “ placed within reach, whoever, though with some
 “ loss of his fortune, enters on that warfare, has
 “ no great reason to boast of his Faith in God.

“ When the riches of the *Roman Churches*, the
 “ power of so many Princes, and the grandeur
 “ of the *Spanish Empire* extended through the
 “ whole world, afforded their assistance and en-
 “ couragement, it was an easy task, even amidst
 “ the greatest dangers, to run before the Standard.
 “ It was rather an instance of human and military
 “ fortitude: at least it did not equal the more fa-
 “ cred glory of the Martyrs and Confessors of the
 “ Primitive Church. They so wholly raised their
 “ views to heaven, as that nothing remained on
 “ earth to engage their hopes. After this exam-
 “ ple LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS reposed an entire
 “ confidence in God, to repay what they had lost
 “ and sacrificed in his Cause, and received scarcely
 “ any earthly pledge of their future reward, no
 “ human security of divine hope, no present com-
 “ fort. They trusted alone to the Divine Faith-
 “ fulness and Clemency, and expected not to en-
 “ joy even this till a distant period, till after death.

“ Through

“ Through the whole of their lives they were
 “ treated with infamy and contempt, and distin-
 “ guished only for the hatred conceived against
 “ them, and they died without the foretaste of a
 “ more honourable fame *.”

This circumstance as much, if not more than any other, illustrates the sincerity of SOCINUS's faith, and obviates the invidious construction on his conduct, which ascribes to the love of a great name all his sufferings and labours: a construction which a certain writer against SOCINIANISM attempts to ground on the above paragraph of the *Polish Knight*; for having quoted that part of it, which begins the comparison between SOCINUS and IGNATIUS, he subjoins this reflection and misrepresentation. “ No improper comparison, each
 “ was the Author of a new Sect, equally to be
 “ execrated; for the sake of which they appear
 “ with an equal ardour to have left their country,
 “ their estates (if they possessed any) and noble secular posts, professing the same zeal for the Glory
 “ of God, the same warfare of Faith. And truly,
 “ as the same Author himself says, a greatness of
 “ mind and a desire of glory, urged them to set up
 “ new modes of religion; which operated more
 “ powerfully in SOCINUS, as he framed a new
 “ scheme

* PRZIPCOWII, Vita SOCINI. Soc. Oper. tom. i.

“ scheme of Principles, or the plan of a more noble Faith*.”

This is the turn HOORNBECK gives to the sentiments of PRZIPCOWIUS: and it is surprizing how a person, who has any regard to truth or candour, can advance what is here advanced, namely, that SOCINUS was urged by a thirst after glory and the honour of being the Head of a new Sect, on the pretended authority of a Writer; all whose reasonings, the whole scope of whose discourse, are intended to prove that SOCINUS was not, and could not be influenced by any motive but by a firm and genuine Faith.

Besides it should be observed, that SOCINUS freely and candidly acknowledged his obligations to the writings and instructions of his Uncle LÆLIUS: that he had not influence and power to prevail with the Ministers and Friends, whom he had allowed to publish his discourse against FRANCIS DAVID's sentiments, to print it without erasing some passages that opposed their own sentiments on the point of the Invocation of CHRIST†: was denied the benefit of Communion by the UNITARIAN Churches

* See HOORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum Religionis. Trajecti at Rhenum*, 1658. p. 567.

† *Opera SOCINI*, tom. ii. p. 710.

Churches themselves: and that these Churches were not in a situation favourable to the views of glory, or capable of conferring dignities on their advocates.

Let any one judge, whether in such a situation the hopes of fame were not cut off; and whether SOCINUS could be actuated by the vanity of appearing the Author of a new Seet, when he possessed so little of the power and weight of the head of a party amongst the UNITARIANS themselves: although their obligations to his pen, judgment and eloquence were so considerable. His case was certainly very different from that of others, and of CALVIN in particular:—who commanded so much respect as to procure an early and extensive reception of his religious System, in opposition to those of other Reformers, eminent for their wisdom, learning and character, and of a more amiable temper and manners—who on his settlement at *Geneva* had the affairs of the Church committed to his discretion—who acquired also a high degree of influence in the political administration of that Republic—and whose power and authority as PRESIDENT in the Assembly of the Clergy, and in the Consistory or Ecclesiastical Judicatory were so great, that when he was at the point of death, he advised the Clergy not to give him a successor, and proved to them evidently the dangerous consequences of entrusting

entrusting with any one man during life a place of such high Authority*.

Here indeed every thing favoured the prospects of an ambitious Mind; Vanity was flattered, a commanding weight of Character was gained, and the love of Power fully gratified. We see it was not thus with SocINUS. Candour can ascribe his conduct then to no motive so naturally, as to the sincerity and strength of his Faith. He esteemed it a rational part to hazard every advantage, to meet every evil for the sake of Eternal Life.

“ To urge and engage us to attain that immense
 “ good, for which CHRIST and his precepts are to
 “ be obeyed, though this obedience cannot be
 “ rendered without enduring some things hard and
 “ grievous to our flesh, any even the least probable
 “ hope of that life and happiness which is
 “ proposed to such as act so is (says he) sufficient,
 “ Since that reward, by its own intrinsic excellence
 “ and importance, attracts the desires of all to it:
 “ neither is there any man who will not confess,
 “ there is no labour or suffering so great, but what
 “ he ought to endure for the sake of obtaining it;
 “ therefore it requires by no means such conspi-
 “ cuous

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. vol. iv. p. 77. note 2.
 ed. 8vo.

“ tuous and permanent evidences, as the recom-
 “ pence proposed under the Mosaic Dispensation
 “ needed*.”

It appears to be on a full conviction of the excellence, importance and influence of Divine Faith, that he advises his friend DUDITH, above all things
 “ so to calm and compose his mind, that he might
 “ remove every opposition in the way of duty, and
 “ by all means attain to happiness and immortality:
 “ this determination of your mind alone (he adds)
 “ more than any thing else, will obviate and lighten
 “ every difficulty that can arise to obstruct your
 “ faith or practice.” And further on, “ It is with
 “ me a clear point you will never enjoy peace, till
 “ you can disengage your mind from the impres-
 “ sions of calumny and the fear of what man can
 “ do to you; and, not regarding these things, re-
 “ pose yourself wholly on GOD and his Provi-
 “ dence†.

On these principles he thus expresses himself, with respect to a calumny which affected his own reputation and interest ‡. “ I am sorry, though I
 “ indeed

* SOCINI Epistol. ad DUDITHIUM. *Racovia*, 1635. p. 27. vel SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 499. col. 2.

† Ut supra, p. 73. & p. 80. vel p. 508. col. 1.

‡ Ut supra, p. 82. vel p. 509. col. 2.

“ I indeed foresaw it, that according to some in-
 “ telligence sent from *Vienna* to *Cracow*, it is there
 “ said, that I fled from *Poland* because I had writ-
 “ ten a Book against Magistracy. Therefore to
 “ prevent the unhappy effect such a rumour might
 “ have upon my affairs in *Italy*, I had determined,
 “ and afterwards did write to the GRAND DUKE
 “ to clear myself, and to the GRAND DUCHESS,
 “ to use her interest with her Husband on my be-
 “ half: and I hope this will aid and favour my
 “ concerns. But may what seems best to the Su-
 “ preme Being take place.”

It may not be superfluous to give the Reader
 another paragraph, in which he strongly expresses
 his apprehensions on the obligations every Christian
 is under to govern his views, and form his conduct
 by the principles of Faith. “ If the man (says he)
 “ who does not act according to the principles of
 “ rectitude and reason, because he certainly fore-
 “ sees some great evil will be incurred by observ-
 “ ing them, be worthy of blame: how much more
 “ does he deserve blame, nay chastisement, who
 “ neglects the practice of righteousness, when he
 “ has reason to believe it would produce infinite
 “ advantages. Though a conduct repugnant to
 “ the Divine Will, and of course opposite to right
 “ reason, may appear to offer some great recom-
 “ pence,

pence, by securing honour, interest, or pleasure; or though on the other hand the avoiding of vice, and a course of actions agreeable to rectitude and conformable to the Will of God, may threaten to involve a man in great calamities, and to draw after it ignominy, the loss of fortune, and severe bodily sufferings: yet he who is favoured with the Christian Revelation should reflect, that the discoveries there made of the Resurrection of CHRIST from the dead, his Ascension into Heaven, and Advancement to universal Dominion, afford the strongest grounds to hope, that the reward proposed for the imitation of CHRIST will abundantly compensate, nay infinitely surpass every evil before sustained. Nor can it be doubted, that unless his heart is wholly enslaved by his worldly and sensual passions, he will resolve to obey the Will of God; and, solicitous to escape the punishment God will inflict on the disobedient, will be ever after able, by the Divine Assistance, to persevere in a course of obedience, till at length he shall rise to glory, riches, and joy, that are unspeakable and eternal *."

Daniel Defries's These

* SOCINI Breves quidam Tractatus. Racoviae, 1618.
p. 96, 97, vel SOCINI Opera, tom. ii. p. 457. col.
1, 2.

These passages strongly express a lively sense of the superior importance of eternal life, above the temporary interests of the present state. It is a too true as well as melancholy fact, that the justest sentiments and sublimest truths often drop from the pens of those whose hearts do not feel their power, and whose lives do not display their influence. But when there is a harmony and correspondence between the sentiments of a man and his conduct, it is at least a strong presumption, that these are the result of real conviction, and that this is the effect of the impressions they leave on the mind. The circumstances in which SO-
CINUS was placed being considered, it is not easy fairly and candidly to ascribe his behaviour to any other principle than to a firm and habitual belief of the reality, and a thorough persuasion of the infinite moment of Eternal Life.

The above quotations appear clearly and fully to justify this construction of his conduct, and others of the same kind might have been added. These passages shew what were the views he entertained on this point, they shew that he considered a conduct like his own as a just and natural consequence of the belief of the Gospel; they shew, that if he did great things, they flowed from the great prospects he indulged, and that he disre-
garded

garded the things that are seen, because he looked at the things unseen and eternal. He acted as he thought and spoke. And this consistency in his character alone gives it weight and dignity. The power of these sentiments was further displayed in his zeal to attain and spread the knowledge of religious Truth. This is a part of his character, we are next to open

SECTION II.

The Zeal of Socinus.

NO passion perhaps has proved more mischievous, more fatally deluded those whom it has possessed, or been more subversive of the rights and happiness of mankind than pious zeal. Ecclesiastical History reads us a shocking and distressing account of the holy frauds it has practised, of the dissensions it has fomented, of the numbers it has bound in chains, impoverished, imprisoned, and murdered.

From whence hath this arisen, but from hence, that men have strangely imagined that the Glory of God was to be advanced, not by enlightening the mind with calm debate, but by alarming it with

terrors; not by the pursuit of knowledge and truth, but by an invincible adherence to every preconceived notion; not by sacrificing their own interest, but by sacrificing the interest and lives of others? This mistaken zeal has opened prisons, and sheathed the sword in the bowels of fellow-men and fellow-christians.

Those worthy men in different ages of the Church, who, whilst they have discovered a just concern for Religious Truth, and have glowed with a divine Enthusiasm in its cause, have expressed their zeal, not by usurping it over the rights and consciences of others, but by impartial enquiries, strong arguments, and a modest appeal to the judgment of men and the authority of Scripture; not by bringing others to corporal sufferings on account of their supposed errors, but by a generous self-denial in foregoing honour and wealth, and a constancy of patience in enduring very severe trials themselves, and even death for what they esteemed the Truth of God: these persons deserve to be had in veneration by posterity, and their zeal ought to be held up to imitation. What has been advanced in the narrative, may serve to justify the claims of SocINUS to this respect and honour. The sacrifice he chearfully made, the many labours in which he laid himself out, are at once instances of the effects

effects of true zeal, and striking proofs of the reality and greatness of that which warmed his bosom.

“ I do not in the least approve of those (says he)
 “ who neglect all enquiries into the truth of prin-
 “ ciples not absolutely necessary to Salvation. For
 “ there are many things, which though not neces-
 “ sary, are extremely useful, and the perfect know-
 “ ledge of which will greatly assist an obedience
 “ to the precepts of JESUS CHRIST, in which, as
 “ I have said, I place the whole of Christian piety.
 “ Even at this day there prevail in those Churches
 “ that have a true knowledge of the Christian pre-
 “ cepts some doctrines, which though they do not in
 “ themselves absolutely deprive men of Salvation,
 “ yet scarcely allow that regard to these precepts,
 “ without which there is no salvation: such are
 “ those which relate to our Justification, the Di-
 “ vine Providence and human Strength, and their
 “ connection with Piety. But I much more blame
 “ them, who, while they embrace the Truth in
 “ those Doctrines that chiefly affect a pious prac-
 “ tice, yet do not desire to teach it others, but al-
 “ together dissemble and suppress it; nor openly
 “ join themselves to those Churches, in which,
 “ besides a just acquaintance with the Com-
 “ mandments of CHRIST, this Truth is also pro-
 “ fessed.”

“ fessed *.” SOCINUS with the utmost propriety might pass these censures on those who are indifferent to the discovery and advancement of Religious Truth: for he himself was diligent in investigating it, and strenuous in spreading the knowledge of what he considered as the Truth of God. In this cause he resigned the prospects and gave up the dignities he derived from his descent, and which his noble connections afforded.

For on his Father's side he sprang from a very antient family of PATRICIAN rank, in the Republic of *Siena*: which produced not a few persons illustrious for their Virtue and Learning, chiefly devoted to the study of the Law, in which, as by a kind of hereditary excellence, they surpassed their cotemporaries. His Mother AGNES was the Daughter of BURGESIUS, sprung from the PETRUCCI, who were Princes of the same noble Republic.

SOCINUS reckoned among his Ancestors and Relations the SALVETTI and PICCOLOMINI, celebrated *Italians*. Amongst the former, CAMILLA, the Daughter of PAULUS, a noble *Florentine*, being married to MARIANUS SOCINUS the younger, had two Sons, ALEXANDER and LÆLIUS SOCINUS, the

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 373. col. 1.

the one the Father, the other the Uncle of FAUSTUS; both men of distinguished parts: among the latter was VICTORIA, Wife of BURGESIUS, Prince of *Siena*, Grandmother of FAUSTUS SOCINUS; she was the daughter of ANDREAS PICCOLOMINEUS, Lord of *Castillo* and *Piscatia*. The Father of this ANDREAS was SYLVIVS, a Patrician of *Siena*, and his Mother was VICTORIA, of the Family of the FORTEGVERRÆ: his Brother was ÆNEAS SYLVIVS, that ornament of the age, who after he was advanced to the dignity of the Pontificate, as a reward due to his merit, assumed the name of Pope PIUS II. LAODAMIA, the Sister of both, was married to NANNUS TUDESCHINUS, and bore him two Sons, ANTONY and FRANCIS PICCOLOMINEUS; the latter of whom rose by his Learning, through various Degrees of honour, to the same high station or rank his Uncle had enjoyed, and was dignified with a like name, viz. that of PIUS III. The former as a reward of his active services for FERDINAND, King of *Arragon* and *Naples*, having obtained in marriage with MARIA, the Daughter of the King, the Dukedom of *Amalphitanus*, transmitted the same to his posterity.

We must not here omit the BURGESII, for amongst them the Daughter of NICOLAUS, being married to PANDULPHUS, a Prince of *Siena*, was

the Mother of BURGESIUS PETRUCCIUS, Prince of the same territories, Grandfather of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, and of GERMANUS ALPHONSUS, a Cardinal in the *Romish* Church. This Family also reckoned amongst its Honours, CAMILLUS, who gained the dignities of the Pontificate, with the name of Pope PAUL V. and his Uncle of the same name, Metropolitan Archbishop of *Siena*. It would be too tedious a task to enumerate the other illustrious Persons of Ecclesiastical or Civil Rank, who filled the highest Posts of Cardinals, Archbishops of *Siena*, and Bishops of *Ostensis*, *Clustinum*, and *Snanenensis*; as the Dukes of *Gravinenfis*, *Mons Martianus*, and *Bisignanus*; the Marquisses of *Biton* and *Capistranum*; the Earls of *Calanus* and *Nicastor*; the Lords of *Plumbinum*; the URSINI, the VENTURINI, the CHISEI, the BECCII, the MARSILII, and other distinguished ornaments of *Italy*, allied in blood and marriage to FAUSTUS SOCINUS*.

Such was the Nobility of his stock and the splendour of his alliances; which had a natural tendency to beget aspiring thoughts, and of course opened to him prospects that flatter the hopes of ambition and the pursuits of greatness. But he gave up all the advantages of such distinguished con-

* Epist. de Vitæ A. WISSOWATII, apud SANDII Bib. thecam ANTI-TRINITARIORUM, p. 223, 224.

connections for the sake of religious knowledge and truth. And he further gave up all the privileges and dignity, he was actually invested with in the court of the GRAND DUKE of Tuscany; after he had spent twelve years in that palace, filling a post of high honour, and sharing the esteem and confidence of his Prince. No clearer proof, no stronger evidence of the sincere and ardent attachment of his mind to Religion could be given than the voluntary resignation of the emoluments and dignities of his situation. He despaired of obtaining the GRAND DUKE'S permission to leave his Court; and his apprehensions were well founded: for often afterwards by letters and messages, especially by the influence of PAULUS JORDANUS URSANUS, a nobleman who had married the GRAND DUKE'S Sister, did he solicit the return of SOCINUS: but the resolute firmness, though accompanied with his usual modesty, with which he refused it, shewed that he as steadily adhered to, as he nobly embarked in the cause of Religious Knowledge and Truth.

Without being considered as a partial Panegyrist, may I not be allowed to represent this conduct as a noble instance of zeal? For he voluntarily sacrificed the prospects of riches and of a Court, forsook his country and his friends, and for the hopes of
 heavenly

heavenly things trampled under foot all earthly greatness. It is not supposable, that his mind was wholly untouched with, unaffected by the grandeur and prospects of high life; and that he gave up what neither charmed his mind, nor flattered his views. For, as his BIOGRAPHER observes, if from nothing else, yet from the vivacity and force of his genius, we may suppose that his mind at times felt the emotions of ambition, and the ardour of youthful passions. It was the more extraordinary that they should cool and subside in the air of a Court.

Courts are not friendly to Sentiments of Religion, nor to Integrity. They have an unhappy aspect on Virtue, and a powerful tendency to draw off the thoughts from the objects of Faith. For the will of Princes is far from always harmonizing with the Will of God and the laws of Rectitude: and the great things of this life so dazzle the eyes and captivate the heart, that the prospects of Immortality displayed by the Gospel are not seen or felt. *Exeat aula*, says Lucan, *qui vellet vivere pius*.

“ The maxims of a Court, remarks the upright
 “ Mr. WHISTON, are against the maxims of Chris-
 “ tianity; the maxim of a Court is this, that you
 “ must always say and do as the first Minister would
 “ have you; the maxim of Christianity is this,
 “ that

“ that you must always say and do according to
 “ your own judgment and conscience. He ventures
 “ to inform us accordingly, that after his principal
 “ friend Lord STANHOPE had been some time a
 “ Courtier, he freely asked him, WHETHER HE
 “ HAD BEEN ABLE TO KEEP HIS INTEGRITY AT
 “ COURT. To which, says he, he made me no
 “ reply, whence I concluded he had not been able
 “ to do it. For he would never tell me a lie.
 “ Which opinion is but too certainly confirmed
 “ by another passage, which I had from the best
 “ authority. It was this: Lord STANHOPE was
 “ once in company, but leaning on his arm, in a
 “ musing posture, seemed to take no notice of
 “ them. At last he started up, and, in a kind of
 “ agony, said, *Well, I am now satisfied, that a man*
 “ *cannot set his foot over the threshold of a Court, but*
 “ *he must be as great a rogue as ever was hanged at*
 “ *Tyburn.* And though such a saying may seem
 “ sufficiently extravagant, yet have I seen so few,
 “ or rather none at all, either of the Clergy or
 “ Laity, Men or Women, made better by a Court
 “ and its preferments, and so great a number ut-
 “ terly ruined thereby, as is very melancholy for a
 “ good man to think of. It puts me in mind of
 “ what that excellent Preacher and Liver Bishop
 “ FLEETWOOD, as I have been informed, said
 “ upon the like occasion. This good Bishop once
 “ came

“ came to the House of Lords a little too early,
 “ and overheard certain persons debating this
 “ question, Whether a Courtier could be a Chris-
 “ tian or not? And when, at length, the company
 “ perceived he was there, they would needs have
 “ his opinion, he replied, He was no Courtier, nor
 “ would determine that question; but he acknow-
 “ ledged, that he had learned so much from their
 “ discourse, that it was not very fit for a good
 “ Christian to go to Court*.”

The sentiments of these persons on the snares of such a situation serve to give us an idea of the temptations SOCINUS resisted, and of the strength of mind he displayed in resigning the emoluments and foregoing the dignities of his high employment at the Palace of the GRAND DUKE. His sense of the importance and excellency of Religious Knowledge was superior to every attachment; and Eternal Life outweighed, in his estimate, all the splendours and honours of this life. Entertaining these views, and possessed with such sentiments, he left a Court more a Christian than he entered it, and more earnestly set upon the pursuit of Truth.

His age at this time, as he was only thirty-five, the period of perfect vigour and when the mind is most

* WHISTON'S Life, vol. i. p. 260.

most susceptible of the great things of life ; the renewed invitations given him to return, and his firmness after he had felt the inconveniences, evils and sufferings of a state of Exile and Persecution are as clear proofs, as in considering the actions of men we can desire, that this step was not the consequence of any disgust, the effect of ill-humour and spleen, or of superstition ; but proceeded only from such a preference of Religion, such a zeal in its cause as overbalanced every motive, his high rank, his noble connections and the favour and power of a Prince could suggest.

His future conduct shewed, that he still continued to feel the same sentiments. He reflected upon the time spent in the Court of the GRAND DUKE, with much regret, and the review of it was painful. “ Do you (says he, in a letter to a friend) “ who, being (as I conjecture) in the vigour of “ your age, wantest nothing to assist your attainment of a more than common proficiency in “ Divine Science, bend all your endeavours that “ way, and exert yourself that the time may not “ pass on uselessly ; and do not imitate me, who, by “ I know not what unhappy influence, when I had “ just tasted of the fountain of Divine Truth, was so “ torn from it, that I gave the greatest and best part “ of my youth to certain vain studies, nay to in-
“ dolence

“ dolence and sloth, which as often as I think of,
 “ the reflection affects me to that degree, that I am
 “ almost tired of life. Although the Divine Mercy
 “ is my comfort, which I experience and feel has
 “ been afforded to me, the most unworthy and
 “ guilty of men*.” As he sacrificed so much,
 that he might freely employ himself about his own
 and other men’s Salvation; so he persisted to lay out
 himself, his time and strength in these interests. He
 exerted himself with great labour, with perpetual
 watchings and unwearied study, to investigate Di-
 vine Truth, and to clear it from the fictions with
 which, he apprehended, men had encumbered and
 corrupted it†. He was engaged in frequent confe-
 rences and disputations, in defence of the Religious
 Profession and Opinions of those Churches who re-
 fused to admit him to their Communion‡. “ After
 “ I came into *Poland*, he says, I desired nothing
 “ more earnestly than to be united to the Brethren
 “ in the closest ties of Communion; though I
 “ found that in many points of Religion they thought
 “ differently from me, as many do to this day: and
 “ God knoweth, what and how great things I do
 “ suffer and will suffer on this account; declining
 “ in

* Opera, tom. i. p. 459. col. 2.

† MOROSCOVIUS, Preface to SOCINI Periph. in
 John i. 1, &c. vel SOCIN. Opera, tom. i. p. 139,

‡ SOCIN. Opera, tom. i. p. 432. col. 1.

“ in the mean time no labours, how hazardous and
 “ detrimental so ever, which either the Brethren
 “ themselves have enjoined me, or which I hope
 “ may be useful to our Churches.”

In his Works are to be discovered the marks of diligence, close thought and repeated application. Some of them passed through different editions under his own care and inspection: some he published at his own charge. He underwent the fatigues of many long journies, most of them from the utmost borders of *Silesia* to the midst of *Lithuania*. He lost his fortune, health and fame. He often exposed his life to imminent danger. He declined nothing, he omitted nothing to gratify his ardent zeal to promote Divine Truth; to the study and propagation of which he had devoted himself. He was ready to meet death itself in this cause, and desired Martyrdom.

His friend DUDITH * had animadverted upon his expressing such wishes: his answer will illustrate this part

* This DUDITH, whose name has occurred several times in this Chapter, was a distinguished character in the sixteenth Century. He was born at *Buda*, 1533. He was successively advanced to three Sees in *Hungary*, by the Emperor FERDINAND, was made Privy Counsellor to that Prince, and was deputed to attend in the Council

part of his character. " I don't think that I said I
 " desired death ; but only this, that I should esteem
 " it

Council of *Trent*, in the name of the Clergy of *Hungary*. There he discovered the arts of the Church of *Rome*, and imbibed such a dislike of Popery, that he forsook that Faith, resigned his Civil and Ecclesiastical Dignities and Preferments, and embraced the Protestant Religion. He resided at *Cracow*; and being naturalized, was twice married to Ladies of noble Families; by his last Wife he had a Daughter, afterwards married to *HIERONYMUS MOROSCOVIUS*. He first joined himself to the *CALVINISTS* in *Poland*, but on observing their bitterness and cruelty towards the *UNITARIANS*, and the many instances in which they needed a further reformation, he separated from them and joined the *UNITARIANS*. He embraced the sentiments of *Socinus* on the Trinity and many other points, professed and defended the *UNITARIAN* Scheme till his death, and formed a Church and School for its advancement at *Smigol*. He died in *Silesia*, 1589. Dr. Maclaine says, he was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of his times. He was well acquainted with several branches of Philosophy and the Mathematics, with the Sciences of Physic, History, Theology, and Civil Law. He was such an enthusiastical admirer of *Cicero*, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole Works of that immortal Author. He had something majestic in his figure and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive. *Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 180, 181. *London* Edition, 1768. *SANDII Bibliotheca ANTITR.* p. 61. *RUARI Epist. Centuria, Amstel.* 1677, p. 443. *LUBIENIECII Hist. Reform. Polon.* p. 222, 223.

" it a great Favour if God saw fit, to undergo Death
 " for his Truth, and be conformed in this respect
 " not only to others whom he has loved, but also to
 " his only and best-beloved Son and my Lord. Nei-
 " ther can I dissemble, that it has often appeared
 " surprising to me that you should intimate you
 " have different thoughts, and should declare it as
 " your wish you may not be obliged to lay down
 " your life as a Martyr for CHRIST. Why so? Is
 " it that a little may be added to the residue of your
 " years? Of how great value I pray you, if your
 " death was left to your own choice, are those few
 " decads of years you may continue longer in this
 " life? Indeed what would be even ages, and thou-
 " sands of years that must at last come to an end?
 " Recollect those words that deserve to be written
 " in letters of gold, which a man, destitute of the
 " true knowledge of God, and of all solid hope of
 " another life after the present, uttered; *Nothing*
 " *appears to me lasting which has an end: for when that*
 " *arrives, what is passed hath fled away: that only re-*
 " *mains which you have obtained by virtue and right*
 " *conduct.*

" Perhaps you may plead your meaning was,
 " that you might not endure and feel the agonies
 " and distresses attendant on Martyrdom. But in
 " what light are these to be viewed, when God af-

E

fords

“fords strength to support them patiently and
 “cheerfully out of love to him, but as a pledge
 “and earnest given a Christian of future immor-
 “tality and blessedness. Therefore, on no account,
 “unless I am mistaken, should we, who profess
 “Christianity, declare that we wish not to be num-
 “bered amongst the Martyrs for CHRIST; especi-
 “ally before them who pay little regard to Reli-
 “gion, and who will seize the advantage afforded
 “them by such kind of speeches, to harden their
 “minds in their lukewarmness, and to believe that
 “our hearts do not glow with zeal for it. I sup-
 “pose you will clearly perceive my meaning, and there-
 “fore I shall not use more words to express it. I
 “only request this, that you will excuse my free-
 “dom, since I think it my duty thus to address
 “you *.”

These facts and these sentiments expressed the
 ardent zeal with which he pursued the Salvation of
 his Soul, and the Advancement of Religious Truth.
 The advantages he sacrificed and the evils he met,
 both tended to the same important and divine ob-
 ject. There was nothing which could deter or di-
 vert his mind from this excellent and laudable pur-
 suit.

“ I am

* Epist. iv. ad DUBITHIUM, vel Soc. Opera, tom. i.
 p. 509, col. 1, 2.

“ I am determined (he writes in one of his let-
 “ ters) not to regard what others, who hold no
 “ mean rank among our brethren, may think or
 “ say of me. This shall be my only concern, not
 “ on the account thereof, to remit any thing of my
 “ studies for the whole Church.” And again in the
 same letter, “ As for myself, if you regard the
 “ flesh, my lot hath been severe; but if you con-
 “ sider its reference to the soul, not to be re-
 “ gretted. Nay I thank God, whose will it was I
 “ should suffer any thing for his glory and that of
 “ CHRIST, and that he in the mean time granted
 “ me firmness of mind, whereby I am more ani-
 “ mated to fulfil my course and calling*.” And
 there was not room for calumny itself to asperse
 him with the least suspicion of worldly views. For
 if he had not put out the little money he had to
 interest, it would all have been expended in two
 or three years, and he and his daughter would have
 been reduced to extreme want. And although for
 five years together he lived in the house, and was
 freely entertained at the table of M. BUCCELLA, yet
 at the end of that term he was worth less money
 than when he first went to reside with that Gentle-
 man. Nay, he was so disinterested, that whilst he
 enjoyed his kindness and hospitality, and so was sup-

E 2

plied

* Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 459. col. 2. & p. 460.
 col. 1.

plied with every necessary, he absolutely refused to accept a present which a wealthy friend intended to make him, though he expressed the warmest sense of the favour. So far was he from making a gain of Godliness*.

SECTION III.

His Candour and Moderation.

“ I Deny, saith a good Writer, that any Cause
 “ or any Truth, though ever so important, can
 “ ensure the title of Christian Zeal to an ill spirit
 “ in contending for it; a spirit of haughtiness and
 “ arrogance, of falshood and impatience of con-
 “ tradiction: though a man fill the world with ne-
 “ ver so much noise about Orthodoxy, or about
 “ Liberty, or about any thing, let it be called by
 “ some name proper to it, for with this spirit true
 “ Zeal it cannot be, no more than the blusters of
 “ a tempest or the flames of an *Ætna*†.

Nay,

* Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 457. col. 2. & p. 473. col. 1.

† GROVESNOR'S Cruelty in Religion no Service of GOD. Preface, p. 13.

Nay, this malignant spirit of arrogance and rancour, equally betrays a defect in the mental power of the man, as it indicates the want of the spirit and temper of a Christian. “ The lowest understanding (to use the expressive language of the excellent and candid Dr. DODDRIDGE) the meanest education, the most contemptible abilities may suffice to give hard names and to pronounce severe censures. A harsh anathema may be learnt by heart, and furiously repeated by one that could scarce read it, and, as was in truth the case in some antient Councils, may be signed by those that cannot write their names. But true Catholicism of temper is a more liberal thing, it proceeds from enlarged views, it argues a superior greatness of mind, and a riper knowledge of men and things*.” On these principles a presumption arises in favour of FAUSTUS SOCINUS; that a person of his great capacities, and whose conduct afforded striking indications of laudable Zeal and firm Faith, would in his deportment and writings express a suitable Candour and Liberality of heart. The evidences of this are now to be laid before the Reader; and impartiality requires us to consider those particular instances of his behaviour that appear to breath a contrary spirit. If such

E 3

should

* Sermon on Christian Candour and Unanimity, p. 31. 8vo.

should be found, it may serve to leave on our minds an affecting conviction of the weakness of human nature, which in its most excellent and amiable forms is never free from some imperfection, scarcely from some great blemish and stain.

One would think that it should be no very laudable exercise of candour, to allow to an adversary all the merit of the worthy and great qualities he possesses; yet the rareness of this virtue gives it a value. SOCINUS appears to have been willing on all occasions to do justice to the character and learning of those who differed from him, and against whom he took up his pen. Thus he speaks of THEODORE BEZA, as having among the CALVINIST Divines but few equals, either in erudition or in penetration of mind or elegance of genius *. And he freely owns that in *Poland*, and other parts, the CALVINIST churches abounded with men of eminent learning and wisdom †. In the preface to the large piece of his against PALEOLOGUS on the province of the magistrate, he says, “to speak
“ the truth, it appears even to myself somewhat
“ surprising when I consider who I am, that I
“ should not hesitate to enter the lists with so great
“ a man as PALEOLOGUS, who so much exceeds
“ me

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 706, col. 1.

† Idem, col. 2.

“ me in learning and eloquence; neither could I
 “ approve my conduct, did I not regard religion
 “ as no private business, but the public concern
 “ of every person *.” To others, whose senti-
 ments he deemed it incumbent upon him to con-
 trovert, he paid the respect due to them, as men
 of distinguished sagacity and extensive learning †.

But SOCINUS seems to have possessed a liberality
 of temper superior to that which merely allows to an
 adversary the praise of distinguished literary furniture
 and mental endowments. He expresses sentiments of
 christian affection for those whom he considered as
 involved in great errors, and was far from confin-
 ing salvation to his own views and party. It ap-
 peared, indeed, rather wonderful to him that any
 who embraced the orthodox doctrine of Justifica-
 tion through the righteousness of Christ, should live
 in a manner worthy the christian name: “ Yet, says
 “ he, I confess there have been and now are
 “ those who receive it and live the life of Christians;
 “ but either they have not heartily imbibed it
 “ or felt its influence, or have not closely attended
 “ to the consequences that flow from it, or on
 E 4 “ some

* SOCINI Opera, tom. ii. p. i.

† Namely FRANCIS PUCCIUS and ANDREAS VOLA-
 NUS, vol. ii. p. 264, 375.

“ some account, GOD hath been peeuiliarily propi-
 “ tious to them, and not suffered them to fall by
 “ those circumstances of danger, in which they
 “ are continually converfant *.

In another place he writes thus : “ I doubt not,
 “ nay, I very well know, that it is the settled
 “ principle both of PAPISTS and CALVINISTS,
 “ and seems to be that of some in the very
 “ church to which I exhort the CALVINISTS to
 “ join themselves, that the errors relative to the
 “ Essence of the Father, the Son and the Holy
 “ Spirit, are of such a kind as to exclude from the
 “ church of Christ those who are involved in them,
 “ and consequently do not afford the possibility of
 “ salvation to such. But we hold on this head
 “ milder sentiments, and firmly believe, that who-
 “ ever confides in and obeys GOD and Christ, will
 “ certainly obtain eternal life. We further see
 “ that there are many mistakes about the Essence
 “ of these Three. Indeed the errors mentioned
 “ above do not necessarily obstruct the faith
 “ of any in GOD and Christ, or draw him into a
 “ course of disobedience to them : Yet as we have
 “ hinted, we doubt not but these errors may easily
 “ produce this effect as they obscure and change
 “ the way and manner in which eternal Salvation
 “ is

* Opera, tom. i. p. 695. col. 1.

“ is imparted from above, and give a false view
 “ and explication of the whole mystery of our
 “ redemption *.”

Writing to one to whom he was personally a stranger, but who had opened a correspondence with him, in a very affectionate and respectful strain, SocINUS replies; “ I am truly grieved
 “ that I am not the person you conceive me to be;
 “ except, as you have heard of me, that *I am not*
 “ *of any party*. And although I have joined myself to
 “ that Church, as far as I could with a good con-
 “ science, which appears to me more pure than
 “ others; yet I do not condemn others, or by
 “ any means despise them; but acknowledge all
 “ as true Churches of Christ, where the voice of
 “ Christ speaking in his precepts is heard, though
 “ they appear to me not to entertain just senti-
 “ ments on some doctrines not relative to these
 “ precepts; and all who observe these precepts I
 “ esteem the true members of Christ †”. A lit-
 “ tle after he subjoins, “ All such truly meet toge-
 “ ther in the name of Christ, who propose it to
 “ themselves as the object of their association, to
 “ confide in him and obey him, and who will re-
 “ ceive, as brethren, those who do this, tho’ they
 “ may

* Opera, tom. i. p. 700. col. 2.

† Idem, p. 373. col. 1.

“ may not wholly agree with themselves in religious sentiments.”

In another letter to the same person we meet with these enlarged views. “ As to what you assert, that after the age of the Apostles, there was an entire apostacy, and that from those times the very foundations were subverted; this cannot be proved to my satisfaction, as I have written you in my other letters: I learn from yours, for I have reserved no copy of them, I have offered my reasons for this, to which you do not appear to have made any reply; and yet expect that I should demonstrate the falsehood of your assertion, when though I had offered no proof of my opinion, I might justly require you would shew me clearly what you have so constantly advanced about an entire revolt, and the subversion of the very foundations of the Christian Church. The reason I produced was this, that nothing more is required to constitute the visible Church of Christ, for of that I speak, than the true knowledge of the precepts of CHRIST. Since in CHRIST, as PAUL saith, *nothing avail-eth but a new creature, keeping the commandments of GOD given by JESUS CHRIST, and faith which works by love*, 1 Cor. vii. 19. Gal. vi. 15. Gal. v. 6. For all the commandments of CHRIST are con-
tained

“ tained in love. And JOHN saith, *He that loveth*
 “ *his Brother abideth in the light, and there is none oc-*
 “ *casion of stumbling in him,* 1 John ii. 10. and that
 “ *such are passed from death unto life,* ch. iii. 14. In
 “ brief, if any one is willing to be satisfied that no-
 “ thing more is required to obtain eternal Salvation
 “ than the observation of the precepts of CHRIST,
 “ besides many declarations of CHRIST and many
 “ assertions of his Apostles plainly importing this,
 “ let him particularly read the first Epistle of JOHN,
 “ in which this is so strongly inculcated, that no room
 “ for doubt can remain in any mind. But who will
 “ venture to deny that to be the true visible Church
 “ of CHRIST which holds the Doctrine sufficient to
 “ obtain Salvation? And that long after the time
 “ of the Apostles, and now there are Assemblies of
 “ Men who hold these precepts no one, I think, will
 “ deny. For as to what you say concerning the
 “ Foundations being removed, meaning they were
 “ after the times of the Apostles removed, because
 “ the true knowledge of the Essence of GOD and
 “ and the Person of CHRIST was obscured and lost,
 “ this is repugnant to what I just now shewed, that
 “ to keep the precepts is sufficient to eternal Salva-
 “ tion; nor can it by any means be proved true.
 “ The knowledge of GOD and CHRIST indeed forms
 “ the foundation of our Salvation, not so much
 “ as it signifies an accurate acquaintance with their
 “ nature

“ nature and substance, but as it requires our recei-
 “ ving the will of God revealed by JESUS CHRIST.
 “ Life eternal is to know the Father who is the only
 “ true God and JESUS CHRIST whom he hath sent.
 “ In the sacred Scriptures to know God and JE-
 “ SUS CHRIST doth not signify an acquaintance
 “ with their Essence and Substance, but the know-
 “ ledge of their will and obedience to it*.”

I cannot resist an inclination to give in connection
 with the above sentiments those of the pious and be-
 nevolent Dr. DODDRIDGE, in his admirable dis-
 course of *Christian Unanimity and Candour*.

They are alike enlarged and generous. “ To
 “ reverence with filial duty and love the God of
 “ heaven and to adore him with integrity of
 “ heart, to honour JESUS his Son as his brightest
 “ image, subscribing to the truth of all he is *known*
 “ to have revealed, and the authority of all he is ap-
 “ prehended to have commanded, conscientiously to
 “ abstain from every known evil, and to practise, as
 “ far as human infirmity will permit, the comprehen-
 “ sive precepts of *living soberly, righteously and god-*
 “ *ly, still looking for the mercy of our Lord JESUS*
 “ CHRIST *unto eternal Life*; assuredly expecting a
 “ future Judgment and an eternal world; care-
 “ fully

* Opera, tom. i. p. 374, 375.

“ fully endeavouring to prepare for both, by set-
 “ ting the affections on those great objects, which
 “ the Gospel opens to our view; and finally being
 “ habitually ready to sacrifice life and all its enjoy-
 “ ments to that blessed hope:—This, this, my bre-
 “ thren (says that good and great Man) is the es-
 “ sential character of every Christian, and where
 “ we see this, is the man to be hated and suspected?
 “ I will add, can I refuse to esteem and embrace
 “ him, merely because he worships in another As-
 “ sembly, or according to a different form, because
 “ he expresses his apprehensions about some of
 “ these doctrines in different words, because he
 “ cannot see all that we think we discern in some
 “ passages of Scripture, or because he imagines he
 “ sees something which we discern not*.”

It is clear that the charity of SOCINUS was more
 extensive than some of the UNITARIANS in *Poland*.
 For in one of his Epistles he says, “ There are
 “ some among us who cannot yet perceive the dif-
 “ ference between what is necessary and useful
 “ in our Religion, with whom I find by this that
 “ you do not agree, in thinking the knowledge
 “ our people have of the Nature and Essence of
 “ GOD and CHRIST different from the common
 “ sentiments necessary to Salvation; and in my ap-
 “ prehensions

* Page 12, 13. 1st Edition.

“prehenſions you judge perfectly right. Other-
 “wiſe all muſt periſh, who are, or have been, or
 “ever ſhall be deſtitute of this knowledge. From
 “whence it will follow, to omit other abſurdities,
 “that many of the moſt holy Men and Women,
 “and even Martyrs for CHRIST, have periſhed*.”

Such views, much more liberal than the generality
 of our great Reformers had of the things neceſſary
 to Salvation, it muſt be allowed, have a natural and
 happy tendency to ſoften the ſpirit of controverſy,
 to calm the temper, and to correct that aſperity of
 manners which frequently imbitter diſputes and ir-
 ritate an adverſary. How far they had ſuch influ-
 ence on SocINUS, the following paſſages will ſhew.

Speaking in a letter to a friend of one who had
 publiſhed ſome ſtrictures on one of his pieces, “I
 “wiſh, ſays he, the Author of that book, whoever
 “he is, if he ſhould derive no other benefit from
 “reading my defence, may at leaſt receive this
 “from it; that when he animadvertſ on the works
 “of others, he would, after my example, write
 “without invectives and railing, and ſo preſerve
 “and diſcover in this reſpect the modeſty and
 “piety, I underſtand from your letters he is en-
 “dowed with. For I own, I was greatly grieved
 “when

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 417.

“ when I read over his performance to find in it so
 “ much bitterness and severity against me.”

In the Preface to his book against PALEOLOGUS on the Province of a Magistrate, we meet with these reflections on the strain and spirit of that author's remarks on a piece of GREGORY PAUL, drawn up to defend the sentiments of the *Racovian Churches* on that subject: “ You (says SOCINUS) in
 “ your answer to him, have so attacked and defam-
 “ ed a man of distinguished judgment and learn-
 “ ing, and one who hath laboured with great ac-
 “ tivity and diligence in the Church of God, with
 “ opprobrious language and invectives, calling him,
 “ to omit many others, *a mad and most unlearned*
 “ *Writer and an idle and slow belly*; that it appeared
 “ to me not only an act of Religion to assist and
 “ defend, according to my best ability, what things
 “ he hath truly and piously written; but by the
 “ same means to vindicate his good name and re-
 “ putation from your sophisms and calumnies. And
 “ that I, who compared with you, may be justly
 “ deemed a dwarf, should enter on the field of con-
 “ test with you, will surprize no one who reflects on
 “ the power of Justice and Truth. Especially when
 “ Piety and Religion are *at stake, and the peculiar Glory*
 “ *of the Almighty Lord*, who we cannot suppose will
 “ desert his own cause, is connected with Righteous-
 “ ness

" nefs and Truth. The example of the youth DAE
 " VID is well known; who, relying on the Divine
 " Assistance and Protection, himself almost naked
 " and unarmed, attacked the Giant GOLIAH well
 " furnished and guarded with armour, and easily
 " conquered him and laid him prostrate on the
 " ground. You will complain perhaps, because I
 " wish to conceal my name, but without reason.
 " For how can an ignorance of my name in this
 " dispute be of any disservice to you, or the know-
 " ledge of it of any use? The contest of each
 " of us ought not to be with the man, but with his
 " opinions. In my judgment, in literary disputes,
 " much more in those that relate to Religion, it
 " were better if disputants were mutually ignorant
 " of each other's name, than that they should know
 " them. For so there would be no danger of
 " wounding each other's reputation, and less room
 " for indulging to mutual revilings, reproaches and
 " sarcasms, foreign, nay contrary to the cause. It
 " often happens, that the opinions of one party, ei-
 " ther in themselves, or through their being mis-
 " understood or misrepresented by the adversary,
 " or rendered invidious by the arguments em-
 " ployed against them, whether these arguments be
 " just or not, are of such a nature as may draw the
 " advocate for them into the danger of his fortune
 " and life."

Then

Then observing, that PALÆOLOGUS had neglected the necessary caution which should have been observed on this point, as the sentiments he opposed were highly displeasing to Magistrates, SOCINUS adds: “ It is not without reason I find, that many
 “ good men have suspected you were urged on to
 “ that work, not so much by a desire of defending
 “ the Truth and promoting the Divine Glory and
 “ Salvation of man, as you was by the strong hope
 “ of casting an odium on your adversaries; and of
 “ securing to yourself, by their sufferings and ruin,
 “ some advantage and stability. But I will assert nothing of this kind, when it was possible you might
 “ fall into this error of publishing the names of
 “ your adversaries, through inconsideration.”

And further on, in the same Preface: “ I will not
 “ say there is little hope that a man who speaks with
 “ the confidence and assurance you do, and who undertakes to instruct and reprove those that differ
 “ from him with so great severity in his published
 “ writings, altho’ admonished in a mild and friendly
 “ manner, will ever acknowledge the falshood of his
 “ opinions, or retract what he hath once said or
 “ written; yet I thought it proper, throughout my
 “ answer to your Book, to address myself to you,
 “ both that I might by every means convince all
 “ that I have no unfriendly disposition towards you;

“ and that I may more easily pursue my purpose,
 “ which is not to assail you with invectives and
 “ foul language, but only to reprove you, and to
 “ convince you by weight of reason. If never-
 “ theless I should sometimes bear rather too hard
 “ upon you, the kind and candid Reader, I think,
 “ will see that the subject required it, and that it
 “ proceeds not from the unruliness of my temper,
 “ but from the great heinousness of the thing on
 “ account of which I shall reprove you. Slander
 “ and detraction thrown out against you; as they
 “ would be very useless to me and the cause I am
 “ about to plead, so they are quite contrary to my
 “ design and purpose. For I have resolved, as I
 “ differ most widely from you in the subject of de-
 “ bate, so to be as unlike you in the management
 “ of it as possible. For you have not only loaded
 “ with reproaches GREGORY PAUL, but likewise
 “ most bitterly inveighed and raved, almost like a
 “ drunken man, against all the *Racovians*. This is
 “ not, believe me, PALÆOLOGUS, becoming either
 “ your gravity or learning, or the nature of the case,
 “ or the profession of the Christian name. Nor is
 “ there any thing which will so effectually prevent,
 “ I will not say your adversaries, but even any other
 “ men, not quite senseless, from embracing your
 “ doctrine, though it should be true, than the very
 “ unsuitable manner with which you treat your
 “ opponents

* opponents and defend yourself against them;
 “ than which nothing can be more foreign to your
 “ design, if the propagation of what you contend
 “ for, as the Truth of God, is dear to you. But of
 “ this you yourself should judge *.” The fourth
 part of his Answer to the same Writer he opens in
 this manner. After having observed that one, who
 had perceived how many errors he had clearly de-
 tected in his Book, would scarcely suppose any re-
 mained to be exposed, and yet that so many still
 remained, that he could only select out the most
 gross and remarkable for the animadversion of his
 pen, he adds, addressing himself to PALÆOLOGUS:
 “ But I beg you not to resent my conduct, or sup-
 “ pose I am led into it by an high opinion of myself.
 “ For it is far from my intention to do you any
 “ injury; and I am fully convinced that I am
 “ a meer common man, and therefore not only
 “ liable to err, but to err frequently and egregi-
 “ ously. But when I have considered that many
 “ ascribe to you so great an acquaintance with sa-
 “ cred Science, as readily to espouse what you
 “ shall advance concerning the ordinances of our
 “ Religion, and that amongst the things asserted by
 “ you many appear to me not only false, but very
 “ hurtful, of which you have not only scattered the
 “ seeds, but also set not a few plants, in the Books
 F 2 “ against

* SocIN. Opera, tom. ii. p. 1—4.

“ against which I have taken up my pen ; when I
 “ consider this, with no design to injure you but to
 “ assist others, I thought the weight of your autho-
 “ rity was to be lessened ; and I am myself dis-
 “ posed to be in return publicly reprov’d by you,
 “ if I shall be found in an error. For though
 “ there be no danger that any should be biaßed by
 “ my authority, since I have none ; and there seems
 “ scarcely any reason why you should in this respect
 “ tread in my steps : yet if, whilst I openly reprove
 “ you, I have rashly uttered any thing worthy of
 “ censure, it is just I should bear the punishment
 “ of my rashness *.”

To these passages it may be proper to subjoin
 one or two more, as specimens of the strain and
 manner of his Controversial Pieces.

One finishes his Book DE SERVATORE, and is
 by way of reply to the conclusion of COVETUS’S
 Remarks on the Efficacy and Operation of CHRIST’S
 Death. Having quoted that conclusion, he says,
 “ There is nothing in this conclusion which requires
 “ an answer from me ; unless that I thank you, be-
 “ cause whilst you consider me as embracing senti-
 “ ments with respect to the undertaking of CHRIST,
 “ contrary to the Truth and repugnant to the sacred
 “ Scrip-

* SOCIN. Opera, tom. ii. p. 92. col. 1, 2.

“ Scriptures and greatly wandering into bye paths,
 “ you have endeavoured to bring me again into the
 “ right road, as you apprehend it, by reason and
 “ the testimony of Scripture. And truly for this
 “ your uncommon humanity and kind expressions
 “ of concern for me, I do now and ever will own
 “ myself justly indebted to you. Many, whose senti-
 “ ments correspond with yours, have treated me in
 “ a very different manner, and have wholly avoided
 “ me, as if I were an infectious person. If ever
 “ therefore an opportunity should offer of repay-
 “ ing the favour, I will not give occasion for you,
 “ or any one, deservedly to accuse me of ingrati-
 “ tude, although I may appear to have sufficiently
 “ repaid your kindness. I have declined no la-
 “ bour in fully answering your Book, to rescue from
 “ a perilous state one who is involved in very great
 “ and hurtful mistakes, and who being set over
 “ others, to shew them the way of Salvation, does
 “ not himself entertain just conceptions concern-
 “ ing it. But this was done under such a bad state
 “ of health and amidst so many other avocations,
 “ that when I had got half way through my answer,
 “ I was obliged to lay it entirely aside for eight
 “ months. And I could devote only a part of the
 “ day to it for the rest of the time: especially as I
 “ was under the necessity of dictating from my
 “ copy to the scribe all that was already written;

“ my hand not being legible to him or any other
 “ person. You will not wonder then, if what I
 “ promised to do was finished much later than you
 “ expected: nor should you impute it to my ne-
 “ gligence, or any other less excusable cause.

“ If my labour prove not useless to you, I shall
 “ think I have performed my promise soon enough.
 “ This the probity and candour of your mind en-
 “ courages me to hope: if you were destitute of
 “ these dispositions, not the strongest reasons, nor
 “ clearest testimonies of sacred Scripture I could
 “ throw together to unfold the Truth, would avail
 “ any thing. You yourself, I hope, will allow there
 “ is no reason why I should desire any thing more
 “ from you on this subject: you may perceive that
 “ every thing that favours the opinion on which
 “ our disputation turns, has been noted by me,
 “ and for a long time most carefully examined and
 “ weighed.

“ If yet you should either attempt a refutation
 “ of my answer, or because you may doubt of some
 “ things advanced by me, should write me again,
 “ I will reply as soon as the matter may appear to
 “ require it. But there will undoubtedly be an end
 “ to our writing each other on this subject, if you
 “ prefer above all things the Truth and Glory of
 “ God,

“ GOD, and at the same time your own and others
 “ Salvation.

“ If hitherto, in preaching the Gospel, you have
 “ ignorantly advanced any thing reflecting on him
 “ (*i. e.* GOD) and his Son, and whilst you thought
 “ you were promoting the Salvation of the people
 “ committed to you, have contributed to their con-
 “ demnation; you should pray to GOD, as I do
 “ most sincerely, that it may please him graciously
 “ to pardon you, and to pour out his Spirit on
 “ your heart, and enlighten it with the knowledge of
 “ himself. FAREWELL. *Basil, 12 July, 1578.*
 “ Yours in CHRIST, F. S.*”

The last quotation to be produced on this head,
 shall be from the conclusion of his Answer to
 FRANCIS PUCCIUS, a polemical piece on the state
 of man before the fall. “ Neither in advancing my
 “ own opinion, nor in refuting yours (says SOCI-
 “ NUS) nor in detecting your great errors, do I
 “ (as you seem to suspect) seek the praise of my
 “ genius; but my care is to exert my best powers
 “ lest the Truth should be obscured, or genuine
 “ Piety be in any degree diminished. Whilst I am
 “ wholly intent on this, I am on my guard as much
 “ as possible, lest I should wound you by reproaches

F 4

“ and

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 246. col. 2.

“ and invectives; although I have been notoriously
 “ and frequently provoked by you. If any thing
 “ has unknowingly escaped me, that may give more
 “ pain than is proper, I fervently and very ear-
 “ nestly intreat your candid forgiveness.

“ But out of a concern for your Salvation I still
 “ more ardently beg or rather admonish you, that
 “ from henceforth in all debates, either in person
 “ or writing, with me or any other person, you
 “ would refrain from railing. For, besides that
 “ it is unbecoming a man of your rank and learn-
 “ ing, and assists the cause of an adversary, it ex-
 “ cludes him who is habituated to it from the
 “ kingdom of GOD, as PAUL plainly declares, who
 “ commands us not to eat with men of this turn
 “ that profess themselves Christians. But if we
 “ are to refrain from reviling, as we would not
 “ be deemed unfit for the Kingdom of GOD,
 “ much more ought we to refrain from calumnies;
 “ in which yet, in your Book against me, you ap-
 “ pear to have delighted.

“ You see then your duty. If you perform it,
 “ and study to practise unblamable purity of life
 “ and Christian sanctity, whatever may be your
 “ sentiments on the subject of our debate, I will
 “ always

“ always acknowledge you for my Brother in
 “ CHRIST, and shall think there is a sufficient
 “ agreement between us: and what you have very
 “ kindly promised, you will do for me, if I hold
 “ the Truth with you, *i. e.* as I understand it, if I
 “ assent to the truth of your opinion, this I will in
 “ reality perform. For I will be careful to learn
 “ from you, those many things in which you can
 “ instruct me; and to my best power will assist you
 “ in all your studies and undertakings.

“ But if I perceive you are not disposed to lay
 “ aside the old man and put on the new; although
 “ not on this question only, and about all the pre-
 “ cepts of the Christian Religion, but also in ex-
 “ plaining all the sentences and even the words and
 “ syllables of the sacred Scriptures, your sentiments
 “ should perfectly correspond with mine, yet will I
 “ not own you as a Brother, or look upon myself
 “ as agreeing with you. I hope indeed you will
 “ display before us the true Christian, in deed and
 “ in word. For you cannot be ignorant what se-
 “ vere punishments from God hang over those
 “ before whom heavenly truth is laid open, but
 “ who do not live becoming this knowledge. May
 “ God the greatest and best of Beings, in his
 “ clemency never leave you, and may he direct
 “ and

“ and over-rule all your studies and labours to the
 “ benefit of his Church *.”

These are excellent sentiments, and I apprehend
 will be deemed to breath a just and liberal way
 of thinking, not very common in those times.
 Some of our first and greatest Reformers wrote in
 a different strain †. The spirit of his polemical
 Works

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 369. col. 1, 2.

† “ CALVIN’s treatment of CASTELLIO furnishes an in-
 “ stance of this. The latter not inferior to CALVIN him-
 “ self in learning and piety, had the misfortune to differ
 “ from him in judgment in the points of Predestination,
 “ Election, Free-will and Faith. This CALVIN could
 “ not bear, and therefore treated CASTELLIO in so rude
 “ and cruel a manner, as I believe his warmest friends
 “ will be ashamed to justify. In some of his writings
 “ he calls him, BLASPHEMER, REVILER, MALICIOUS
 “ BARKING DOG, FULL OF IGNORANCE, BESTIALITY
 “ AND IMPUDENCE, IMPOSTOR, A BASE CORRUPTER
 “ OF THE SACRED WRITINGS, A MOCKER OF GOD,
 “ A CONTEMNER OF ALL RELIGION, AN IMPUDENT
 “ FELLOW, A FILTHY DOG, A KNAVE, AN IMPU-
 “ DENT, LEWD, CROOKED-MINDED VAGABOND, BEG-
 “ GARLY ROGUE. At other times he calls him, a Di-
 “ sciple and Brother of SERVETUS, AND AN HERETIC.
 “ CASTELLIO’s reply to all these Flowers is worthy the
 “ patience and moderation of a Christian, and from his
 “ Slanderer he appeals to the righteous Judgment of
 “ God.”

CHANDLER’s Hist. of Persecution, p. 312. 8vo.

Works is in general consonant to these sentiments. They are written in a calm, dispassionate and argumentative manner, free from personal reflections and abusive language. So far is it from being common, though a dictate of wisdom, not to say Religion, to spare in religious disputes the name and reputation of an opponent; that most parties have been too ready to expose the lives of their adversaries to danger for the sake of what they deemed the Truth,

The Reader will be pleased with what SOCINUS hath advanced on this head.

I will quote a passage from his Address to the CALVINISTIC Churches in *Poland*. “ It is surprizing that the CALVINISTS there permit, yea rather command, the Christian people to spill human blood; when all men who are real Christians ought to be ready to pour out not the blood of others but their own blood, and even this not in a war carried on by carnal arms, but by the use of the spiritual weapons of Faith, Patience, Constancy and Hope; if the enemies of divine Truth will not allow them to worship God and CHRIST with purity, but compel them to an impious worship by force and arms. This is a great and most destructive corruption of the Christian

“ Christian Religion to suppose, that for the sake
 “ of preserving pure Religion and Divine Wor-
 “ ship, if it cannot be otherwise effected, it is law-
 “ ful to spill the blood of other men; yet it hath
 “ arisen to such a height among the CALVINISTS,
 “ that men of the greatest learning and influence
 “ among them, teach that it is the duty of the Chris-
 “ tian Magistrate not only to suppress by force, but
 “ to put to death those who disseminate heresies,
 “ especially if they be not willing to desist from
 “ their endeavours,

“ They are not ashamed to alledge, in support of
 “ this barbarous and cruel sentiment, the Law of
 “ MOSES, which enjoins the putting to death any
 “ one who should attempt to seduce the ISRAELITES
 “ into the worship of strange gods, *Deut. xiii.* not
 “ considering, that it is one thing to seduce men
 “ into the worship of a strange god, and so to draw
 “ them off from the service of JEHOVAH, the
 “ Lord and Creator of heaven and earth; and
 “ another thing to teach and inculcate other false
 “ doctrines, whilst the worship GOD himself hath
 “ commanded and prescribed is adhered to: es-
 “ pecially when it appears (as is certainly the case
 “ with respect to men of integrity, though other-
 “ wise the greatest HERETICS) that this proceeds
 “ not from a bad design, but from a defect in the
 “ under-

understanding; not, I say, from malevolence but
 “mistake. And they further do not consider, or
 “rather forget, what is in itself certain truth and
 “granted by all Divines, that the judicial precepts
 “of the Law of *MOSES* have no force under the
 “Gospel, and are equally with the ceremonial dis-
 “used by the people of *GOD*, since the glorification
 “of *CHRIST* *.”

When *SOCINUS* could talk in this just and liberal manner, it is a great pity any expressions or sentiments should occur in his Works, or any thing should have appeared in his conduct, not perfectly consistent with these indications of Moderation and Catholicism, and which should induce any suspicions of his countenancing and approving some degrees of intolerance, some modes of persecution.

Some expressions that escaped from his pen—his opinion as to the treatment Heretics should receive—and his conduct in the affair of *FRANCIS DAVID*, have each fallen under censure, and perhaps will not admit a justification. But it is equitable to lay before the Reader the evidence, both against him and in his favour, on these points.

As

* *Opera*, tom. i. p. 697. col. 1.

As to the manner of confuting his opponents, it may be alledged, that in one place he speaks of the **PAPISTS** thus: “ As to myself, I have no doubt but
 “ that all who live agreeably to the commands of
 “ **CHRIST**, whether **CALVINISTS**, or **LUTHERANS**,
 “ or **ANABAPTISTS**, or **ARIANS** (and I am certain
 “ that not a few of each of these orders do, or may
 “ do this) will attain to the heavenly inheritance.
 “ But I will not assert the same as to the **PAPISTS**,
 “ whom I regard as all idolaters; and I know that
 “ no idolater can partake of eternal Salvation *.”
 This is going much farther than most **PROTESTANTS** have done. Their moderation, in this instance, hath in general exceeded that of **SOCINUS**. Whether it may not be owing to a kind of self-love, suggesting that they should spare the Church out of which they arose, and to which they have commonly been too nearly allied in their spirit and the various rites of will-worship. That they have entertained more favourable sentiments of the future state of **PAPISTS**, is perhaps a little problematical.

SOCINUS not only since, but in his own time and by a particular friend, was charged with treating **PALÆOLOGUS** with acrimony, and mingling calumny in his Piece against him. “ The detraction
 “ in

* Tem. i. p. 502. col. 1, 2.

“ in your Book, very contrary to what you pro-
 “ mised, is discernible by all. For you have not
 “ only called him POOR OLD MAN, but have as-
 “ serted he is like to the JEWS, that he is painfully
 “ disturbed and blinded with the Glory of CHRIST,
 “ and that he shakes and demolishes the Kingdom
 “ of CHRIST *.” To this SOCINUS replies, “ You
 “ do not appear to know, or to have considered, the
 “ difference between detraction and a just reproof
 “ and accusation. For what have I ever objected
 “ to my adversary, which I do not at the same time
 “ clearly prove, or at least attempt to prove?
 “ What fault do I find in him foreign to the mat-
 “ ter in debate, especially if my design, which I
 “ had before declared, be duly attended to? None
 “ at all.—For in my Preface I had said it was my
 “ design to attack my adversary with no invectives
 “ and calumnies, but only to reprove and convince
 “ him by the authority of reason.—I added, by
 “ GOD’S help, I would expose many of my adver-
 “ sary’s errors, and would expressly devote part of
 “ my Work to detect the more remarkable of
 “ them.—Who then, without great injustice, will
 “ accuse me of detraction and departing from my
 “ promise, not only to expose the important errors
 “ of PALÆOLOGUS, but expressly to point out his
 “ inconsistency and contradictions; and it may be
 “ added,

* Opera, tom. i. p. 360.

“ added, his triflings, his audacity, his corruptions
 “ of the sacred Scriptures, and the like? If this
 “ should be done more frequently than one who is
 “ more the friend of PALÆOLOGUS than of Truth
 “ would desire, it must be ascribed to the errors
 “ into which he hath often fallen; and it should be
 “ allowed he hath not been treated in the worst
 “ manner, when many of his errors have been en-
 “ tirely passed over.

“ It must not be concealed, that a Gentleman of
 “ singular wisdom, who has a great influence over
 “ me, and to whose judgment I know you would pay
 “ no little deference, so as scarcely to venture to dis-
 “ sent from it, when he heard that I was writing a-
 “ gainst PALÆOLOGUS, advised me, by letters direct-
 “ ed to me, to repress the pride of that hungry LIT-
 “ TLE GREEK, for so he called him. This induced
 “ me to pursue my scheme with more spirit. Nor
 “ indeed do I think that there will be any one, who
 “ hath read the Treatise of PALÆOLOGUS, but will
 “ own that I could not have answered him, in this
 “ respect, otherwise than I have, or that I ought
 “ to have done it more mildly.

“ If it be not too much trouble, I wish you to
 “ read over again the introduction to the fourth
 “ part, and to weigh more carefully what I have
 “ advanced

“ advanced in my defence, especially the latter end
 “ of that book: nay, if you please and have lei-
 “ sure, read over the Treatise itself, compare it
 “ with PALÆOLOGUS, and there is no doubt but
 “ that, with some very excellent and judicious
 “ men, you will not only exculpate me from the
 “ charge of being a reviler, but will even own that
 “ I have acted with moderation; especially when
 “ I did not plead my own private cause, and there
 “ was no danger it should be said, that I was hur-
 “ ried away by the lust of revenge, beyond the
 “ bounds of moderation *.”

I am ready to think that impartial and candid
 persons will allow that these pleas have some weight,
 and do palliate, if not entirely exculpate, the seve-
 rities of SOCINUS's pen against this antagonist. But
 not PALÆOLOGUS alone, it will be said, but FRAN-
 CIS DAVID also, and the doctrine of the Judaizers
 are treated with unbecoming harshness. Thus in this
 very Apology he stiles their sentiments, concern-
 ing not invoking and adoring JESUS CHRIST, an
 impious and detestable opinion, and speaks of it
 as connected with many other most pestilential er-
 rors. He charges PALÆOLOGUS with being the
 cause of great evils in *Transylvania, Hungary, Li-*
thuania, and many other places: as the person who

G

“ raised

* Opera, tom. i. p. 364, 365.

raised up one FRANCIS DAVID in *Lithuania*, and infected the Churches of that Province with his POISON. These views of the light in which the opinions of these persons appeared to him, he alleges as pleas in defence of the strain of his Piece against PALÆOLOGUS.

But such expressions are rather abusive than argumentative, or at best are but mere begging the question: nay, they hold up an adversary in an invidious point of view, are calculated to prejudice others against him, and prevent a calm and fair attention to the arguments on either side. However it must be allowed, there is a difference between these expressions and PERSONAL abuses, and that the former are more excusable than the latter. And in favour of SOCINUS it must be granted, in the general, and on most occasions, he wrote in a different strain. This is certainly to his praise and honour.

But more than Words, FACTS are alledged against SOCINUS; he is suspected, rather charged, with being accessory to the imprisonment of FRANCIS DAVID, who died in his confinement. SOCINUS did not escape blame on this account, says his Biographer. “ It is a vain endeavour to go about
“ to justify SOCINUS from the persecution exer-
“ cised

“ cised on the person of FRANCIS DAVID. BLAN-
 “ DRATA had enough interest and influence with
 “ the Prince of *Transylvania*, to hinder the impri-
 “ sonment, if he had pleased; and SOCINUS could
 “ easily have brought BLANDRATA to temper and
 “ mildness*.”

This is the charge, let us hear the defence: PRZEP-
 COVIUS hath advanced something on this head, and
 SOCINUS himself hath entered into a particular vin-
 dication of his character against all the accusations
 thrown out against him in his own life, on account
 of his conduct towards FRANCIS DAVID.

The *Polish* KNIGHT speaking of this unhappy
 event, and of the blame that fell on SOCINUS, adds,
 “ As if he were not able to vanquish FRANCIS with
 “ other weapons, when the disputations of both are
 “ published; or as if the Magistrate were so de-
 “ voted to the cause of SOCINUS, that at his plea-
 “ sure, or that of any one of the party, he would
 “ employ the weapons of his authority. SOCINUS
 “ did not escape all odium in this matter. But if
 “ any one who favoured the cause of SOCINUS did
 G 2 “ advise

* RELAND's Four Treatises on the Doctrine, &c. of
 the MAHOMETANS, p. 234. See also YAIR's Life of
 SERVETUS, p. 201, 202.

“ advise the Prince to this cruel measure against
 “ FRANCIS, (of which I am nevertheless not cer-
 “ tain) SOCINUS certainly ought not to bear the
 “ blame of it; for he could neither know his design,
 “ nor approve the deed. For, to omit many other
 “ considerations, nothing could be more repugnant
 “ to the sentiments of SOCINUS, than that the doc-
 “ trine which could not be supported by the judg-
 “ ment and eloquence of FRANCIS when alive,
 “ should appear to receive a sanction from the silent,
 “ but striking testimony of his death: especially
 “ when carrying the appearance of a martyrdom,
 “ it turned the eyes of all men to it*.”

This reasoning offers no more than presumptive
 evidence on behalf of SOCINUS. Let it be seen
 whether his own pleas and declarations are more
 satisfactory. In his Preface to the Dispute with
 FRANCIS DAVID, not published till fifteen years
 afterwards, he particularly set himself to answer the
 Calumnies, with which his name had been aspersed,
 and which he was afraid, through his long silence,
 had gained credit among such to whom he was not
 known. By this vindication it appears that his
 character was attacked in more respects than one,
 on account of this affair.

“ I now

* Opera, tom. i. Vita SOCINI, p. 4.

“ I now come to the Calumnies. The first is,
 “ that by letters I accused FRANCIS DAVID to
 “ BLANDRATA of not adhering to the agreement,
 “ and of continuing to discourse and dispute with
 “ me and other persons against the Invocation of
 “ CHRIST. Now, how can I be charged with ac-
 “ cusing this man to BLANDRATA of not adhering
 “ to the agreement, because he disputed with me
 “ on these subjects; when BLANDRATA urged him
 “ to this, and on this account had invited me into
 “ *Transylvania*, and made a provision for my liv-
 “ ing with FRANCIS? And when FRANCIS, of his
 “ own accord, gave me his Theses in writing, on
 “ the subject of not invoking CHRIST; that I
 “ might, if it were in my power, refute them, and
 “ inform BLANDRATA wherein I did not agree with
 “ him; so that by our disputations the truth on this
 “ subject might be investigated,

“ And as to the point of his conversing with
 “ others on this head, so far was I from accusing
 “ him on this ground, I rather always endeavoured,
 “ before his deceit was detected, to persuade every
 “ person there was reason to hope that FRANCIS,
 “ although he disputed sharply with me, yet would
 “ at length acknowledge his error, as he had al-
 “ ready refrained from propagating it; for he pre-
 “ tended this to me, and endeavoured to make me

“ believe it : and I was often blamed by BLAN-
 “ DRATA and others, for my great credulity and
 “ simplicity.

“ Another Calumny is, that I informed BLAN-
 “ DRATA of what passed in the house of FRANCIS.
 “ Nothing can be more foreign to the truth than
 “ this, if you except our disputations; and even
 “ about them I wrote BLANDRATA very seldom.
 “ Besides I did not live and board with FRANCIS
 “ as a spy, a thing by no means suitable to my na-
 “ ture and manners; but only in order to dispute
 “ with him, and bring him to the acknowledgment
 “ of the true Majesty of CHRIST.

“ The third Charge is, that I kindled this great
 “ fire; by which is meant, I suppose, the calamities
 “ into which FRANCIS fell. In which yet he would
 “ not have been involved, if he had followed my
 “ advice. To this I will speak more fully pre-
 “ sently.

“ The fourth Calumny, consisting of different
 “ charges, alledges, that I neglected the province
 “ of answering the writing of FRANCIS DAVID,
 “ and violating my promises, acquainted BLAN-
 “ DRATA with every thing, accused FRANCIS and
 “ his followers of falling into JUDAISM, and of
 “ having

“ having discarded CHRIST to introduce MOSES
 “ into the Church, and insinuated other things con-
 “ cerning him of this kind.

“ As to the first part of this charge, that of ne-
 “ glecting the province of answering the writing of
 “ FRANCIS, it is a plain falshood; as is clear from
 “ what I have said in the beginning of this Pre-
 “ face*. It is likewise another base Calumny my
 “ accuser insinuates, that I solemnly promised not
 “ to inform BLANDRATA of what passed between
 “ us, and of his writing in defence of his own
 “ Theses. For it is by no means probable I should
 “ promise this, when it is very certain it was agreed
 “ on by BLANDRATA and FRANCIS, as my accuser
 “ (*i. e.* the Author of the Narrative) attests a little
 “ below, that FRANCIS himself should draw up in
 “ writing, the first principles on which the subject
 “ turns, and that I should answer.

“ It is also a Calumny to say, that I charged
 “ FRANCIS and his disciples with JUDAISM. As if
 “ on the sight of FRANCIS's writing, I had for the
 “ first time accused them of this privately, and had
 “ not always openly declared to every person, from

G 4

“ the

* Where SOCINUS has related the History of his
 Piece on the Invocation of CHRIST.

“ the beginning of the dispute, that this opinion,
 “ JESUS CHRIST being thus made little account of,
 “ would lead men to MOSES and JUDAISM ; and for
 “ this reason chiefly, that if CHRIST cannot with
 “ propriety be invoked, he is CHRIST not in reality
 “ but only in name. And I remember very well,
 “ that when, in the presence of FRANCIS, I pressed
 “ GLIRIUS his Secretary, and in some respect his
 “ Preceptor, in the course of our conversation,
 “ that he would say, whether he believed that JESUS
 “ of *Nazareth* was really THE CHRIST, he would
 “ return no answer, and obstinately diverted the
 “ conversation to some other subject.

“ I am, fifthly, falsely charged with concealing it
 “ from FRANCIS, that BLANDRATA would declare
 “ himself his enemy to the Prince, till the letters
 “ of the Prince were brought to the Senate, di-
 “ recting the imprisonment of FRANCIS : when yet
 “ BLANDRATA had ordered me to signify this to
 “ FRANCIS, in his own words, by a letter he wrote
 “ me on his journey a mile from *Coswar*. For he had
 “ sent me letters to the same purport, long before
 “ from *Weissenburgh*, as soon as he knew that FRAN-
 “ CIS, contrary to his promise to him, to me, and
 “ to others, had procured some resolutions and
 “ decrees in the Synod at *Thord*, evidently repug-
 “ nant

“ nant to the Invocation of CHRIST. And, by
 “ the by, this conduct of his, not mine, kindled
 “ the great fire of which we before spoke.

“ The truth is, after I had received these let-
 “ ters, I never desisted from admonishing FRANCIS
 “ to act with caution, and to take care to have the
 “ resolutions agreed upon in the Synod, if possible,
 “ repealed ; considering that in reason and by
 “ agreement it belonged not to any particular Sy-
 “ nod, but only to a general Assembly, to deter-
 “ mine any thing on so important a subject : and I
 “ added, that otherwise no small danger threatened
 “ him, since BLANDRATA, who had very great in-
 “ fluence with the Prince, it was very well known
 “ was highly offended at those decrees of the Sy-
 “ nod. And when FRANCIS himself pretended he
 “ feared nothing, and that he thought he had done
 “ nothing, as he always declared, which should
 “ draw on him the anger of the Prince, I remem-
 “ ber I spoke to him in these words, or very nearly
 “ such, *I wish, my FRANCIS, his most illustrious High-*
 “ *ness, the Prince, may put the same construction on your*
 “ *conduct as you do yourself.* And though, for some
 “ good reasons, I did not then expressly tell FRAN-
 “ CIS what BLANDRATA had written me to commu-
 “ nicate to him in his name ; yet I certainly said
 “ enough for him to understand that the disposi-
 “ tion

“ tions of BLANDRATA toward him were changed,
 “ and to induce him in season to provide for his
 “ own safety.

“ Further, what injury could my silence be to
 “ FRANCIS, when BLANDRATA himself, before he
 “ left *Coswar*, and had written these letters to me
 “ the Author of the Narrative refers to, had di-
 “ rected, in my presence, BERNARD, the intimate
 “ friend of FRANCIS, to threaten him in his name
 “ in a much severer manner? But FRANCIS treated
 “ this denunciation also with contempt: nay, when
 “ he ought to have been at least more cautious af-
 “ terwards in spreading his impious tenet, instead
 “ of this on the next day, which was Lord's Day,
 “ and he was according to custom to preach to the
 “ people in the great Church, he expressly asserted,
 “ it was the same thing to invoke JESUS CHRIST,
 “ as to pray to the VIRGIN MARY and other dead
 “ saints. This is attested by general fame and by
 “ letters.

“ I will reckon as a sixth Calumny, what is af-
 “ terwards plainly asserted and is elsewhere insinu-
 “ ated against me, and which in a manner includes
 “ all the former Calumnies; namely, that I was
 “ ungrateful to FRANCIS and betrayed him. No-
 “ thing could be said or objected to any one, more
 “ foolish

“ foolish or more impudent. For how, I pray,
 “ could I be ungrateful to FRANCIS, who really
 “ never received any favour from him? That I
 “ lived in his house and sat at his table, was not a
 “ gratuity of his, but, as I shall observe presently,
 “ I paid for it at a very high rate. This money
 “ was afterwards repaid me by BLANDRATA. On
 “ these terms he invited me from *Basil*, that he
 “ would discharge all the expences of my journey,
 “ and of my stay in *Transylvania*. I lived and
 “ boarded with FRANCIS about four months and
 “ half; and I took care to pay fifty *Italian Crowns*,
 “ by means of the TURRISANI, noted Merchants at
 “ *Norimberg*, to his Son then residing at *Basil*, which
 “ he received, and afterwards acknowledged to
 “ have been sent him by BLANDRATA; from whom
 “ also before this, when he wanted to go to *Basil*,
 “ he had received a large pecuniary present, and
 “ afterwards, when his Father was sentenced to be
 “ imprisoned, fifty *Hungarian Crowns*, whilst he
 “ still continued at *Basil*. As to my being treated
 “ in a very obliging manner, as this Narrative says,
 “ in the house of FRANCIS, though it had been true,
 “ it should not have been considered as a favour
 “ conferred upon me by him: since the handsome
 “ consideration allowed him for my lodging and ta-
 “ ble, required a very obliging deportment towards
 “ me. But FRANCIS shewed me no more complai-
 “ sance

“ fance than he would have shewn to any other;
 “ even the meanest and most worthless person:
 “ this I solemnly declare, and they who knew his
 “ manners will easily credit me.

“ Lastly, it is sufficient to remove all notions of
 “ any favour conferred on me by FRANCIS, that it
 “ was not at his own motion, nor at my request,
 “ that I received from him board and lodging; but
 “ at the direction and order of BLANDRATA, who
 “ had sent for me, and to whom on many accounts
 “ he was under great obligations.

“ As to the charge of treachery, it is of little
 “ consequence to say any thing to it, when it is
 “ very evident that the acts of the Synod of *Thord*,
 “ where FRANCIS, if he did not betray, at least
 “ perfidiously deceived and deluded all of us who
 “ defended the Invocation of CHRIST, were the
 “ first cause, as has been said above, of his cala-
 “ mities; but the last and true cause was the words
 “ he publicly said in his sermon against the Invo-
 “ cation of JESUS CHRIST. For three days after-
 “ wards the Senate at *Coswar* received the first let-
 “ ters of the Prince, in which he ordered FRAN-
 “ CIS to be removed from his ministerial office,
 “ and to be kept under guard. After which let-
 “ ters, as it is by no means probable, so (unless I

“ be

“ be greatly deceived) it is false that FRANCIS ever
 “ ascended the pulpit to instruct the people ; which
 “ yet is confidently asserted in the Narrative, with-
 “ out any mention of the preceding sermon ; that
 “ indeed the true cause of his imprisonment might,
 “ if possible, be wrapt up in darkness : from which
 “ circumstances it is clear, that there is no reason
 “ why any one should suspect me, or any other
 “ person of treachery towards FRANCIS.

“ The last Calumny this Narrative advances is,
 “ that to excuse myself to LUCA, the Son-in-law
 “ of FRANCIS, I accused BLANDRATA and other
 “ Brethren, them of ambition and him of blind re-
 “ sentment ; whom I was obliged to obey, on ac-
 “ count of the services done me by BLANDRATA.
 “ But neither did I consent to any measure against
 “ FRANCIS that was more severe, nor knew of any
 “ other fixed design of BLANDRATA and the Bre-
 “ thren in this matter, nor ever said I knew of
 “ any other, than that BLANDRATA himself would
 “ see to it, that the Prince should order FRANCIS
 “ to be suspended from his public Work, till, as it
 “ had been agreed, an end should be put to this
 “ Controversy on the Invocation of CHRIST by a
 “ general Synod. To this I call GOD to witness*.”

This

* SOCINI Opera, tom. ii. p. 710, 711, 712.

This is what SOCINUS offers to prove his innocence in the business of FRANCIS DAVID. It is clear from it, that several aspersions were thrown on him, which were evidently false; and this renders suspicious at least the charge against him, of being accessory to the imprisonment of FRANCIS DAVID. The fate of this man every generous mind will lament, and think it cruel and undeserved. But if the above apology be to be credited, it was brought upon him, not by the instigation and counsel of SOCINUS but by his own conduct; and by a conduct not wholly fair and upright: an attention to SOCINUS's advice would have saved him from the calamity that befel him. Nay, SOCINUS solemnly protests he consented only to his suspension, and knew not that his imprisonment was a measure determined. And why is not his avowal of his innocence to be regarded? The appeal of a man of his general character to God, the searcher of hearts, seems sufficient to overbalance the unsupported charge and rash suspicion of enemies, who appear by the very manner and style of the charge, to wish to cast an odium upon his name and memory.

May it not be added, if SOCINUS had not been conscious of his innocence, why should he, at the distance of fifteen years, revive the accusations that had been brought against him? Would not a guilty person

person rather have suffered them to die away and sink into oblivion? It does not appear that SOCINUS had the great influence over BLANDRATA, the accusation supposes; it looks more probable, that he was scarcely more than the instrument and agent employed by this man, to refute a notion to which he was greatly averse.

However the subject should be left to the judgment of the Reader, and he should determine freely as evidence may lead him. It is certain from SOCINUS's own confession, that he did approve of and agree to the suspension of FRANCIS: a method of supporting the Truth and opposing Error, which the more just and liberal sentiments of our times will justly condemn.

It is time to proceed to another charge brought against SOCINUS, and which is alledged to support the suspicion of his being accessary to the imprisonment of FRANCIS DAVID. It is this: "That
 " he would have Heretics punished as well as furious and mad men. Although these last deserve
 " compassion, nevertheless when they hurt others
 " they are restrained; and, if it be necessary, they
 " are chained. Thus Heretics deserve pity: we
 " ought, nevertheless, to hinder the efforts they
 " make for the propagation of their doctrine; and
 " if this cannot be prevented by any other me-
 " thods,

“ thods, then even chains and prisons must be employed *.”

This is a quotation from his Works, by way of charge against him. Whether his opinion be fairly represented, or will admit of palliation, is to be known only by seeing the passage in its true connection. It stands in one of his letters; and though it be a long one, yet as it is necessary to set this point in a clear and full light, as it will confirm some things that have been advanced in the historical account of his life, and will serve to illustrate his character, I will give the whole of it.

“ TO MARTINUS VADOVITZ, Professor in the
“ Academy at *Cracow*; the letter of FAUSTUS
“ SOCINUS.

“ Most distinguished and learned Sir,
“ The uncommon kindness you have shewn me,
“ and your own declarations fully convince me,
“ that my letters, though those of a man in general almost hated, will not be unacceptable. Therefore the first occasion which offers of writing to
“ you, I think is not to be neglected. The occasion is this, that I have lately heard as matter
“ of fact, from men worthy of entire credit, that as
“ besides

* RELAND ON MAHOMETANISM, p. 235.

“ besides those who have shewn it by words and
 “ deeds, and to whom I openly profess myself
 “ greatly indebted, there are also some other Gen-
 “ tlemen of your rank to be found, who are con-
 “ cerned for my misfortune, and commend you for
 “ rescuing me from so great a danger: so there are
 “ also some persons of the same rank (*i. e.* Profes-
 “ sors in the University at *Cracow*) who make no
 “ secret of being very much pleased with the ill
 “ treatment I met with, and severely blame you
 “ for not suffering the rage of the furious and cruel
 “ multitude against me to be satiated.

“ If men of any other profession pretended to
 “ so much inhumanity, I should not greatly won-
 “ der, nor think of expostulating at all with you.
 “ But that men who teach literature, and the fine
 “ arts which polish and humanize the mind, though
 “ rough and barbarous, should be so cruelly dis-
 “ posed towards a man not averse from literature
 “ and the arts, and no ways injurious to them: this
 “ appears to me like a miracle, and induces me to
 “ make my complaints to you who profess these arts,
 “ and at the same time to convince you that your
 “ colleagues have no reason to wish me ill, much
 “ less to be so cruelly disposed against me. They
 “ urge, as I am informed, that I am an HERESI-
 “ ARCH, and therefore ought to be so treated. I
 H “ there-

“ therefore absolutely deny both THE ASSUMPTION
 “ AND CONCLUSION of this ENTHYMEMEM. To you,
 “ the President of an Academy, I may be allowed
 “ to talk in this scholastic manner. Nay, I am ready
 “ more fully to prove the fallshood of both if ne-
 “ cessary, and will now attempt it in a few words.

“ For first, as to what belongs to the ASSUMPTION,
 “ I cannot by any means be called an HERESIARCH,
 “ when I have never yet assumed the province of
 “ teaching others in the doctrines of our Religion;
 “ and have published only, when plainly urged and
 “ challenged to it by the requests and commands of
 “ my friends and brethren, and not of my own
 “ will; nor have I ever advanced any DOGMA in
 “ my published pieces, which had not either else-
 “ where, or in this kingdom, where my Works are
 “ published, been in some measure publicly ad-
 “ vanced in writing or by conversation, or partly
 “ asserted and discussed by others, prior to my
 “ arrival here; as I am always ready plainly to
 “ shew.

“ This is very certain, that GREGORY ZARNOW-
 “ VECIUS, the CALVINIST Minister as he is called,
 “ who published a Book, in the *Polish* tongue,
 “ expressly against my Treatise DE SERVATORE
 “ (wherein was contained all that could lead any
 “ one

“ one to suspect me of being the Author of any
 “ new Dogma) asserted in the Preface, that I had
 “ borrowed the sentiments of that Disputation
 “ from the Dialogues of OCHINUS, published
 “ above thirty years ago. And it is certain that
 “ in those Dialogues, many copies of which I hap-
 “ pened long since to see in *Poland*, that notion is
 “ openly expressed and inculcated; which in brief
 “ is, that CHRIST hath indeed by his blood blotted
 “ out and expiated our sins, but in a different
 “ method than is commonly understood; name-
 “ ly, that by pouring out his blood he hath paid
 “ to divine Justice the debt we had by our sins
 “ contracted, or hath satisfied for us and our sins:
 “ since that was not by any means necessary, nor
 “ could GOD exact from any one the punishment
 “ of our sins, or, to speak so, demand from him
 “ our debts, but he freely forgives and remits them,
 “ as the Scriptures most plainly shew. But to as-
 “ sert and defend this notion, is the great and un-
 “ heard-of wickedness, that renders me unworthy
 “ that the earth should bear me.

“ But to return to what I said, viz. that I never
 “ yet assumed the office of instructing others in
 “ the doctrines of our Religion. This is so true,
 “ that I ought to be ashamed of and sorry for my
 “ silence in this respect, had I thought myself fit

“ for this office : otherwise I should be of all men
 “ the most foolish, if I had ever attempted or de-
 “ signed it. But all can attest my silence, with
 “ whom I have ever had any acquaintance, espe-
 “ cially at *Cracow*, where I have spent good part
 “ of my life. Let our *Italians* be interrogated, with
 “ whom I have been chiefly conversant, not one
 “ of them out of so great a number can be found
 “ whom I have attempted to draw from his own
 “ sentiments in Religion to the reception of mine,
 “ or ever held any dispute with upon divine sub-
 “ jects. I have behaved here in that manner, and
 “ such hath been my modesty (unless I should ra-
 “ ther call it sloth and neglect) in this respect, that
 “ I doubt not, but that all who intimately know
 “ me have wondered at it; since they knew I
 “ thought differently from them on Religion, were
 “ well acquainted with my application to divine
 “ studies, and entertained some opinion of my
 “ learning. Therefore I conclude, that though I
 “ were altogether over-run with Heresies, the name
 “ of an HERESIARCH would by no means suit me.

“ For agreeably to the use of language, he only
 “ merits that name, who proposes and teaches doc-
 “ trines new and unheard-of, at least in his own
 “ times—endeavours to persuade others to receive
 “ them—enlists followers—is the Author of a Sect
 “ —and

“ — and has other properties in which I have no
 “ share. Besides what doth all this avail to form
 “ an HERESIARCH, unless the doctrines be false?
 “ But the texts of Scripture, the very careful ex-
 “ amination of them and collations of one place
 “ with another, with which my writings are filled,
 “ and without which I advance nothing, with my
 “ fair, honest and accurate investigation of all the
 “ arguments and testimonies produced by my op-
 “ ponents; these things will convince every per-
 “ son of candour, that no false conclusions are
 “ drawn by me in my disputations, or at least none
 “ on which any one can hastily pass sentence as
 “ false; as is commonly the case with those who
 “ venture openly to charge my published Pieces
 “ with impiety, when yet they have not read, nor
 “ accurately examined, or certainly not understood
 “ them.

“ The fullest proof of this arises from the evi-
 “ dent calumnies they have used in animadverting
 “ on my writings, often ascribing to me and my ex-
 “ pressions what I not only never intended, but
 “ have in those same disputations asserted to be
 “ most false. For instance, they have not been
 “ ashamed to assert, that in my Piece DE SERVA-
 “ TORE, I made CHRIST himself a sinner; when
 “ yet, in the beginning of that very chapter from

“ the words of which they have framed, I know
 “ not how, this most shameful and odious calumny,
 “ I have most expressly supposed that this is the
 “ height of blasphemy, such as I wished might ne-
 “ ver arise in my mind, even in my dreams: many
 “ other things of this kind, not less rashly than falsely
 “ objected to me and my Works, for the present I
 “ omit, but they shall be publicly noted and laid
 “ open, if God permit, by myself or some other
 “ person.

“ However before I leave this subject, the truth
 “ or falshood of those things which I have written,
 “ (to treat of which would require whole volumes)
 “ I will not be afraid to add this, which I have the
 “ strongest reason to think, *viz.* that what I have
 “ advanced in my Works is far from being false, or
 “ can appear so to a diligent enquirer; and that
 “ most of those who have so warmly opposed me,
 “ and desire the annihilation of myself and my wri-
 “ tings, wish it because they themselves suspect that
 “ the Tenets insisted on by me are true, and they
 “ are afraid they will obstruct their own authority
 “ and influence.

“ It is time that I now shew the CONSEQUENCE
 “ as well as the ASSUMPTION in this ENTHYMEMEM
 “ to be false, *viz.* that I deserve all kind of seve-
 “ rity

“ verity and cruelty to be practised towards me,
 “ Let us suppose then that I am an HERESIARCH;
 “ am I therefore to be treated with the greatest se-
 “ verity? No truly: though it should appear, that
 “ I am also an obstinate one: provided I am free
 “ from all charge of sedition, as certainly all must
 “ confess I am perfectly so, and have ever con-
 “ ducted myself most peaceably in the concerns of
 “ Religion; and if I have not attempted to pro-
 “ pagate and disseminate my principles for the sake
 “ of my own private interest, but have done it only
 “ ignorantly, from an apprehension that they were
 “ true, and evidently calculated to form and im-
 “ prove solid Piety in the hearts of men: and this
 “ all, who are not wholly destitute of common sense
 “ and have any knowledge of my conduct, must
 “ be obliged to own.

“ For though all persons may not know what
 “ character I bore at home in my own country,
 “ nor what emoluments and honours I might have
 “ justly expected there and elsewhere, if I would
 “ have conformed to the religious principles of
 “ others; and though they may not know, that for
 “ the sake of Religion I not only took an everlasting
 “ farewell of my most dear and delightful country,
 “ but lost all my estates there, which were not in-
 “ considerable; though all may not know these

“ facts, yet who is so dull or stupid but he may per-
 “ ceive to what perils I am continually exposed,
 “ solely on the account of Religion, especially if I
 “ attempt to draw others over to my opinions ?

“ It would be tedious to rehearse here the great
 “ and various sufferings I endured for the sake of
 “ Religion, after I left my own country, elsewhere
 “ and more especially in this kingdom till I had
 “ fixed my residence here, by the marriage of a
 “ noble *Polish* Lady,

“ That I can propose no advantage to myself
 “ here, nay must expect very great and terrible
 “ calamities, if I do not change my schemes, any
 “ one may be sufficiently convinced by my last af-
 “ fliction alone, when I lost my valuable collection
 “ of Books and Manuscripts, which I would have
 “ cheerfully redeemed with my blood ; suffered the
 “ greatest public ignominy, and was in manifest dan-
 “ ger of my life. On this account your excellent col-
 “ league, in a friendly manner indeed, but not pro-
 “ perly consulting my truest safety, has admonished
 “ me that I should learn by these evils and perils to
 “ become a CATHOLIC.

“ But you will ask, As this is the case, why do
 “ you affirm that although you were an HERESI-

“ ARCH

“ ARCH and an obstinate one, yet you ought not to
 “ have been treated with this great severity? I an-
 “ swer, because when there is a freedom from sedi-
 “ tion and the pursuit of self-interest, then the
 “ HERESIARCH does not labour under a fault of
 “ the will, but of the understanding. Therefore
 “ as we restrain, and, if it be necessary, confine in
 “ chains, mad and frantic persons who would other-
 “ wise be injurious to others, and at the same time
 “ greatly pity them; so an HERESIARCH of this sort
 “ ought not to be treated with the utmost severity,
 “ but should meet with pity: and the only thing to
 “ be regarded is to hinder his endeavours to pro-
 “ pagate his doctrine, and if it cannot be other-
 “ wise done, by chains and a prison. You observe
 “ I speak of an obstinate HERESIARCH: for he
 “ who is not obstinate, hath not contracted that
 “ rage and madness that he should be confined in
 “ chains.

“ Now who can with justice accuse or suspect
 “ me of obstinacy in my religious sentiments. For
 “ except one man, a worthy Monk, whose name
 “ need not to be mentioned, not one person of the
 “ CATHOLIC FAITH hath tried, by debate with me,
 “ to convince me that I have no just ground for
 “ my religious sentiments and separation from the
 “ Com-

“ Communion of the *Romish* Church; and this
 “ Monk only once slightly attempted it, and can
 “ be scarcely said to have argued the matter with
 “ me, for he rather tried by admonitions and pro-
 “ mises to prevail with me to change my course of
 “ life. It cannot indeed be properly said, that I
 “ ever was an adherent to the *Romish* Church, for
 “ as soon as I was capable of exercising my under-
 “ standing on divine Themes, I was taught and im-
 “ bibed different sentiments from those that Church
 “ teaches.

“ But why, before I was publicly treated so ig-
 “ nominiously and was involved in such injuries
 “ and losses, did not some one of those who perpe-
 “ trated those things, or by whose means they were
 “ perpetrated, exert himself to draw me off from
 “ my sentiments on divine things, examine me on
 “ their grounds, and endeavour to refute and en-
 “ tirely overturn them? When besides they per-
 “ ceived, or thought they perceived that I advanced
 “ principles the generality of HERETICS (as they
 “ call them) are either unacquainted with or plainly
 “ condemn, they ought surely to have suspected
 “ that I did not greatly agree with these in the prin-
 “ cipal points controverted between us, and that
 “ therefore the writings of the Catholics against
 “ them

“ them and their opinions, were by no means in-
 “ ficient to confute me or convict me of obsti-
 “ nacy ?

“ Why at least hath not some one canvassed, in
 “ writing, the sentiments they regard as lately in-
 “ vented, taught and published by me ? And why
 “ did they not wait till I had read such treatises, to
 “ see whether I changed my opinions, before they
 “ had vented their rage on me ? But, except ZAR-
 “ NOVECIUS whom I mentioned above, not one in
 “ the kingdom nor out of it hath, as far as I know,
 “ attempted to confute my disputation DE SERVA-
 “ TORE, which hath been published for some years
 “ and contains, they apprehend, these sentiments.
 “ But how far the Work of ZARNOVECIUS is to
 “ be deemed a refutation, my friend I hope will
 “ soon shew ; who, as I cannot do it myself, will
 “ answer him for me, and as is most proper in the
 “ same language in which he hath written.

“ I suppose you perceive my excellent VADO-
 “ VITZ, that though in other respects I should be
 “ an HERESIARCH, I can by no means be esteemed
 “ an obstinate one. From which it follows, that
 “ not only I ought not to be treated with the utmost
 “ cruelty, as is their wish ; but that every outrage
 “ committed against me was highly iniquitous, es-
 “ pecially

“ pecially when offered by those who had no com-
 “ mand or authority over me. Was it not great
 “ cruelty that a man descended from the noblest fa-
 “ mily, almost sixty years old, when scarcely re-
 “ covered from a severe sickness, on the very day
 “ he had taken physic, should be violently dragged
 “ out of his house, without shoes and half naked,
 “ through the mud and the market, in the view of all
 “ the city, treated like a malefactor led to execution,
 “ loaded with a thousand invectives, reproaches and
 “ curses, and plundered of all those things that I
 “ value almost as dear as life itself? I did not think
 “ indeed in the kingdom of *Poland*, a nation not a
 “ little inclined to humanity, the temper of CALI-
 “ GULAS and NEROS could be found; who not
 “ contented with an innocent man’s being severely
 “ harrassed, would wish to treat him with greater
 “ cruelty, perhaps with the most cruel torments
 “ and most excruciating punishments. Therefore,
 “ as I have said in the beginning, though I have
 “ heard such things of some of your colleagues,
 “ from persons of the greatest veracity, yet I scarce-
 “ ly believe them.

“ But be these reports more or less true, I have
 “ been ready and shall always be ready to prove
 “ my innocence, and to offer a reason for all that I
 “ have said or written relative to Religion for the
 “ nineteen

“ nineteen years I have lived in this country,
 “ or before this period. Upon this account,
 “ in my Book DE SERVATORE, which I foresaw
 “ would be the occasion of much trouble to me,
 “ as the event hath also shewed, I not only took
 “ care to have my name inserted, which I had not
 “ done in my other polemical Pieces; but for three
 “ years and a half after its publication, I continued
 “ to live in the capital of the kingdom and should
 “ have continued to reside there still, and not have
 “ left it when the royal COMITIA were held, though
 “ I knew that by that Book, just published before
 “ the meeting of the COMITIA, both the CATHO-
 “ LICS and the CALVINISTS were much more en-
 “ raged against me than before; and that some ap-
 “ plied to the COMITIA to inflict some very severe
 “ punishment on me, on the account of that Book:
 “ though this Treatise were neither published by
 “ me, nor the dispute it contains held in this king-
 “ dom, nor with any one of this nation. But,
 “ before I came hither, I wrote it at the challenge
 “ of a certain CALVINIST Minister, a *Frenchman*,
 “ and then a resident in *France*.

“ Yet I was nevertheless disposed publicly to
 “ shew my readiness to defend it in this kingdom,
 “ where it was first printed, and openly professed
 “ that I was not ashamed of what I had asserted in
 “ it.

“ it. Let those CATHOLICS stand forth who think
 “ they are able to prove my doctrine to be im-
 “ pious blasphemy, or at least not consonant to
 “ Truth; and let them, either by writing or in
 “ person, argue against me. They shall all see,
 “ that by CHRIST’S help, whom they charge me
 “ with treating most injuriously, I will either so-
 “ lidly refute what shall be objected to it by them;
 “ or, if I shall be convinced of error or blasphemy,
 “ will immediately yield to them, publicly recant
 “ it, and at the same time thank them for drawing
 “ me out of the mire, and rescuing me from the
 “ danger of losing eternal Salvation. And perhaps
 “ the influence of my example, may lead many
 “ learned and pious men to do the same, with
 “ whom I agree in religious sentiments, and who
 “ have not yet discovered any thing weak or im-
 “ pious in that disputation.

“ Further, what I have said of this Book, as I
 “ have just before hinted, I meant to say of all my
 “ Publications. For although most of them be
 “ without my name, yet there is at this day no one
 “ (if I mistake not) who will not, upon the reading
 “ them, discover that I am the author of them.
 “ On this account I say, that my errors must be
 “ pointed out to me, before it can be evident that
 “ I am obstinate. When this is proved, although,

“ as

“ as I have shewn, Piety and Reason require us not
 “ to treat with cruelty even obstinate HERESIA-
 “ ARCHS, when they are not seditious and led by
 “ selfish and secular views; and though I cannot
 “ (as it hath been proved) be justly accounted by
 “ any one an HERESIARCH, and be clear from
 “ the least shadow of sedition and the lightest sus-
 “ picion of seeking my own emoluments; yet do I
 “ not refuse to expose myself to the severest tor-
 “ ments, and to suffer the most ignominious and
 “ cruel death.

“ I wish you, most excellent Sir, to learn from
 “ my own letters these things concerning myself
 “ and my disposition, on the occasion of what I
 “ have heard relative to your colleagues, and their
 “ cruel opinion with respect to me: that if these
 “ things should meet with your approbation, as I
 “ hope they will, you may more easily and readily
 “ persevere to treat me with kindness, and be fur-
 “ nished with considerations that may enable you
 “ to bring others of your rank to entertain the
 “ same sentiments of me. This I earnestly request
 “ of you, not so much on my own account, as for
 “ the sake of equity and justice; which, I am fully
 “ persuaded, you above all things love and pursue.
 “ I beg you will present in my name, my best wishes
 “ to the honourable Rector, to the reverend
 “ LELOVITAS

“ LELOVITAS, also to the very excellent GODE-
 “ CIUS, my Patrons as well as yourself, and to any
 “ others of your order whose names I know not,
 “ and who had a share in rescuing me from that
 “ imminent danger; and assure yourself, I will ever
 “ acknowledge my great obligations to you and
 “ them, and whenever I can will chearfully own it
 “ by words and deeds. Excellent Sir, farewell,
 “ and love me as yours. *June 14, 1598.* I am
 “ ever devoted to your distinguished worth.
 “ Your, F. S.*”

The above Letter is the only place that I can find,
 where SOCINUS hath delivered his sentiments about
 HERETICS, and the method in which they should be
 treated. His opinion is undoubtedly repugnant to
 those juster and more generous sentiments, all in-
 quisitive and candid minds now entertain on the
 point. A prison and chains are not proper means
 of setting the mind at liberty from the shackles of
 prejudice and error. Such measures abridge the
 natural right of every man, to use his best endea-
 vours to instruct his fellow-creatures in the subjects
 of Truth and Religion. And the limitation of these
 measures to those who are obstinate is, to say the
 least, liable to the greatest abuse: for the person
 who has the power to confine and imprison, is to
 judge

* SOCINI Opera, vol. i. p. 475—477.

judge of this obstinacy : and what he may censure as obstinacy *may be*, and generally *will be*, a virtuous firmness of mind, and a becoming adherence to the convictions of the understanding and conscience, if not to truth itself. Indeed this method, as well as every other measure an intolerant spirit dictates, is only calculated to suppress religious enquiry, to deter men from the acquisition of knowledge, and to make them hypocrites. The opinion of SocINUS, it is true, is somewhat softened by the conditions he makes necessary previous to such measures; namely, that calm debate and argument should be first employed, to convince the erroneous; but then he does not make a due allowance for the different impressions, the same arguments will make on different minds:

However there is a difference between sending a person to a prison and to the stake; between confining the body in chains and dooming it to the flames. The latter was the lot of the unhappy SERVETUS. The truth is, that the sentiments of those who broke off from the Church of *Rome*, and of our Reformers, were not, on the subject of Toleration, liberal and enlarged. It should rather be ascribed to the times than the men, that they favoured, in one respect or another, Intolerance and Persecution.

LUTHER, notwithstanding he was against punishing HERETICS with death, thought all other punishments might be lawfully used. “ In one place he
 “ says, *It is sufficient that they should be banished.* In
 “ another place he allows, that HERETICS *may be*
 “ *corrected and forced at least to silence, if they pub-*
 “ *licly deny any of the articles received by all Christians,*
 “ *and particularly that CHRIST is GOD.* In a third
 “ place he goes further, and says, that HERETICS
 “ indeed are not to be put to death, but may how-
 “ ever be confined and shut up in some certain
 “ place, and put under restraint as madmen*.”

This is exactly the idea of SOCINUS. He erred no more than did other great men of that age in this respect. The same excuses may be alledged in his favour, as are accepted on behalf of our CRANMERS, our LUTHERS, and our CALVINS: Nay, his Controversial Writings, on the whole, breathe a much better spirit, than is usually to be met with in the works of those times; and he carried his notions of Toleration further than did some of the most distinguished reputation amongst them.

The followers of SOCINUS entertained more liberal sentiments on this point. SCHLICHTINGIUS,

* CHANDLER'S History of Persecution, p. 309, 310. 8vo.

in particular, refutes these notions in answer to a
 LUTHERAN Divine. " Let it be granted (says he)
 " that I am convinced another is in an error, nay,
 " that he is an Heretic, and that my certainty of
 " it excludes all possibility of a mistake; is he
 " therefore to be shackled with chains and thrown
 " into prison, or to be driven from his country, and
 " to be stript of all his fortune? If he hath fallen into
 " error, he is unhappy. Ought the errors of a man,
 " into which no one in his right senses would volun-
 " tarily run, to be turned to his detriment, and to
 " be deemed a ground for rendering him misera-
 " ble? He is already very unhappy, because he is
 " in great errors. It becometh us rather to lament
 " his case, especially the more obstinately he is
 " fixed in his notions; so that you should not he-
 " sitate even to die for him. Can you think him
 " to be irreligious, who is so obedient to Religion
 " and Conscience, as, for the sake of both, to ex-
 " pose himself to the greatest evils: or who, con-
 " demned to death, to a prison, or to any other pe-
 " nalty, cherisheth the firm hope of an heavenly re-
 " ward, and supporteth all calamities with this ex-
 " pectation? Can you be violent towards him, and
 " violate Religion itself in your treatment of so
 " religious a man? Would not such a man, of his
 " own accord, discard his erroneous sentiments and
 " embrace the Truth, if he were sensible he were in

“ an error? Or will a prison, banishment, the
 “ sword, and sentencing to death, rescue the mind
 “ from false opinions?

“ It is urged, he is obstinate, self-condemned,
 “ and knowingly and with design deceives himself.
 “ But no one ought to form this judgment of the
 “ affair; since no one knoweth the secret designs
 “ of the mind, or can penetrate into the recesses
 “ of the soul. Conjectures concerning the heart
 “ are to be allowed no further, than as they are
 “ supported by correspondent actions; by which
 “ CHRIST himself hath taught us to judge of all
 “ false Prophets. It is impossible but their conduct
 “ will betray them. A corrupt mind, a corrupt
 “ judgment, at length appears in corrupt and de-
 “ generate manners. *Men do not gather (says*
 “ *CHRIST) grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. Nei-*
 “ *ther can a bad tree bring forth good fruit.* Hence
 “ PETER and JUDE have so described the manners
 “ of the false Teachers or Heretics, that the men
 “ themselves could not be concealed. No one
 “ then is to be condemned as an obstinate Heretic,
 “ before he hath proved himself such by wicked
 “ actions; who, however he may dissemble his
 “ vices, will never take up the cross of CHRIST.

“ But

“ But let him be plainly convicted of wicked-
 “ nefs and deceit ; let his life and the evil manners
 “ common to deceivers prove his guilt. Is force
 “ therefore to be employed ? Is the Magistrate to
 “ be called in ? Have not you yourself (*i. e.* MEIS-
 “ NER) confessed that the crime of Heretics is of
 “ a spiritual, not of a civil nature ? Will not this
 “ fraud and wickedness, appearing by evident
 “ marks in his conduct, discover him to all the
 “ the pious, to all lovers of truth ? Hence they
 “ will avoid him as sheep do the wolf. This is what
 “ PAUL says of such, *They shall proceed no further :*
 “ *for their folly shall be manifest unto all men,* 2 Tim.
 “ iii. 2.

“ But they will seduce many simple persons.
 “ Are they therefore to be put to death, or thrown
 “ into prison ? Let them rather be convinced and
 “ confuted by the Word of God, than confined in
 “ chains : let others be carefully and diligently ad-
 “ monished to be on their guard against them,
 “ and be inflamed by the threatening danger to
 “ the more ardent study of divine Truth. For it
 “ is often of great advantage to have an enemy :
 “ especially if it be in our power, by the exercise of
 “ caution and circumspection, to conquer him.
 “ Who is a more malicious, who a more pernicious
 “ enemy than the Devil, the father of all

“ Heretics? And yet it hath not pleased God to de-
 “ stroy him ; that having so great an enemy, who is
 “ always disappointed as often as he findeth us on our
 “ watch, we might be excited to the greatest care
 “ about our salvation. This is the only method by
 “ which Heretics are to be exterminated. The way
 “ of proceeding, by sword, fire, bonds and banish-
 “ ment, arms error with authority, while such suf-
 “ ferings are endured on the account of it. He-
 “ resies do not merit, Heretics do not deserve to
 “ be supplied with an occasion to exercise their
 “ patience, and of procuring regard by an argu-
 “ ment which suits Truth only ; neither would they
 “ have this opportunity, if they were not perse-
 “ cuted. But as we have said, the genuine di-
 “ sciples of CHRIST, who profess the plain and so-
 “ lid Truth, which is on all sides supported by its
 “ own strength and fears no Heresies, are not ac-
 “ customed to pursue others for the sake of Re-
 “ ligion : so that it may be justly laid down as a
 “ fixed point, that persecution on account of the
 “ Faith, hath never been endured by any but by the
 “ good from the hands of the bad, or at least by
 “ men of inferior virtue from those of worse dis-
 “ positions*.”

The

* Duæ Quæstiones contra B. MEISNERUM a JONA
 SCHLICHTINGIO, 1636. p. 465—468.

The Reader I apprehend will approve of these sentiments of SCHLICHTINGIUS on the treatment of Heretics, as much more just and liberal than those of SOCINUS. But it may be observed, that the former would probably have never proceeded so far in liberality of thinking, if the latter had not opened the way. Mankind are dispossessed of their mistakes and prejudices only by degrees. A just sentiment is started by one; another adopts it, places it in new and different views, and carries it to its utmost extent. The garden which has been over-ran with weeds and noxious herbs, requires, besides the hand that clears the soil of these obstructions to the growth of good seed, the care and skill of others to carry the beautiful flower and generous fruit to perfection: this is the more pleasing task, and is apt to engross applause; but the former labour is rather most meritorious, and prepares the way for the latter's more agreeable toil. To them therefore, whose studies have cleared away the clouds of error, and scattered in any good degree the mists of ignorance and bigotry, be merit and praise ascribed; though they did not pour upon the human mind the full light of truth, nor entertain the most generous sentiments themselves. A disciple of inferior abilities may improve on the opinions of his master; and a dwarf raised in the arms

of a giant can take in a more extensive prospect than the giant himself.

I am tempted to add here the reflections of an elegant and ingenious Writer, on the improvements in religious Knowledge and Science, to which the Reformation gave birth; and hope the digression will be excused.

“ How much religious and civil freedom are
 “ worth preserving, and what a glorious influence
 “ they have upon human affairs, you will be con-
 “ vinced, by comparing what *Europe* has been
 “ since the Reformation, with what it was before
 “ that period; and that the improvements in every
 “ kind, which have taken place since that time, are
 “ chiefly owing to this cause, will appear evident,
 “ if you reflect that those improvements have only
 “ taken place in countries where men have thrown
 “ off the Papal yoke, or where there are great
 “ numbers of the people who would wish, and
 “ have attempted, to do it. It has been said, that
 “ without DES CARTES, NEWTON would perhaps
 “ never have been; it might have been said, with
 “ greater propriety, that without LUTHER and
 “ CALVIN, DES CARTES would perhaps never have
 “ been.

“ VOLTAIRE

“VOLTAIRE has more than once taken notice,
 “that it was a pity such middling geniuses as LU-
 “THER and CALVIN should have made so many
 “profelytes, while LOCKE and NEWTON have made
 “so few; but he forgets to observe, that LOCKE
 “and NEWTON have had no disciples but in those
 “countries where LUTHER and CALVIN have
 “been followed, and that they are unknown where-
 “ever the doctrine of those middling geniuses has
 “been proscribed.

“These are the words of a smart Writer; and
 “undoubtedly that rational enquiry which the Re-
 “formation not only permits but approves of, has
 “had, and must have, a wonderful influence in
 “enlarging the genius and understanding of
 “men*.”

On the ground of these arguments may we not
 venture to say, that defective as were the sentiments
 of SOCINUS on the subject of Toleration, yet his
 disciple would perhaps never have rejected the no-
 tion of imprisoning Heretics, if the master had not
 before led him to canvass religious topics with free-
 dom, and suggested some just and generous ideas on
 this subject in particular? But, however this may
 be, the foregoing considerations afford a generous
 incentive

* Letters to a young Nobleman, p. 47, 48.

incentive to engage every one to exert his own mental powers, though not great and extensive; as he may be the means of kindling some sparks of light and truth in the moral and intellectual world, which some future genius, more penetrating and fertile, may raise to perfection, and improve to some highly important and useful purposes. Let no one admit too low and discouraging thoughts of himself, nor of his endeavours to benefit mankind.

It may not be improper to conclude this Section in the strong language of a good Writer. “If we would
 “prevent the mischief done in the world, and the
 “horrid scandals to the Christian name, by religious cruelty, it must be by better information;
 “preventing such opinions taking possession of the
 “the minds of men; and this ought to be done as
 “soon as possible, by all possible methods. The
 “whole earth should conspire together for the good
 “of mankind, for the sake of peace and truth;
 “that no man should ever be injured in his life and
 “property for the sake of Religion. This is what
 “Parents and Tutors should early implant: Ministers should teach, and Magistrates ordain:
 “Orators and Poets should employ all the force of
 “their eloquence and charms to persuade it; till
 “it becomes universally acknowledged as a first
 “principle; till a man might travel with his own
 “Religion

“ Religion and Conscience about him, as safely
 “ through the world as every traveller wishes he
 “ might do with his money; and as every man
 “ wishes for himself, that he might do with his own
 “ Conscience and Religion*.”

But let us proceed to another part of SocINUS's
 Character, viz.

SECTION IV.

His Self - Government.

THIS Head of moral Virtues, includes a variety of amiable dispositions and graces; but which, as they are of the more silent and retired kind, are not attended with so great an eclat, as the more shining and active virtues of benevolence, generosity and zeal.

As to SocINUS, what hath been said of his Character shews that he was free from ambition and avarice; and that he sacrificed the prospects of greatness and wealth, in the pursuit of Truth and religious Knowledge. He was reduced to the
 greatest

* GROVESNOR's Cruelty in Religion no Service of God. Preface, p. 110, 111.

greatest straits by his ardent attachment to them. The income of his estate in *Italy* was withheld, and the person who used for some years to manage his estate and make him remittances, could not at last venture to send him the least part of the profits, or even to write to him or receive his letters. His poverty, as it put it out of his power to pay an AMANUENSIS, obliged him to be at the great trouble of transcribing his Works with his own hand, the first copies of which, in the haste of continual writing, were not legible*.

In a letter, bearing date the 2d *December*, 1599, he begs the prayers of a friend, that GOD would direct him, in the decline of life, to the means of providing food and a lodging, that he might be at his own disposal, and free from the incumbrances that prevented his doing something he had promised, and which therefore he was grieved to find was expected from him†. Notwithstanding this, his conscience and generosity would not allow him to use many means, by which he might have remedied, if not advanced, his fortune; he never, by begging, hunted after a reputation for sanctity, and when he could support himself with the most scanty means, he could not be prevailed on to take the presents

* Opera, tom. i. p. 377. col. 2.

† Idem, p. 464. col. 2.

presents freely offered him. Nay, the straitness of his circumstances did not prevent the exercise of Charity. He chearfully expended his little substance on the poor. Nor did he only practise every kind of alms, but every species of liberality. He published some of his Works at his own expence, that he might neglect no means of advancing divine Knowledge and Truth *.

As to the animal appetites, he had a perfect mastery over them. “Whoever would be a true Christian, and partake of the salutary grace offered us by CHRIST, should (says SOCINUS) as much as possible abstain from all unnecessary pleasure, that he himself and his friend may exercise the greatest charity to their neighbour; which that man certainly will not do, who wanteth meats and drinks more palatable and delicious, than a sound and good state of health requireth; for this is clearly unnecessary pleasure: nor if he or his friend expend more than is necessary on meat and drink; for all that is expended above this, takes away the power and abridges the ability of exercising charity to their neighbour †.”

The

* Opera, tom. i. Vita Soc. p. 6, 7.

† Opera, tom. i. p. 72. col. 1.

The practice of Socinus was, in this respect, agreeable to his doctrine. He was sparing in the enjoyment of meat and sleep; and, without affectation, abstained from all pleasure; only he seemed over careful of his health. In his dress he was modest, but neat and elegant; for though he were averse from pomp, yet he had a taste for the less showy ornaments.

His deportment to his friends was obliging, and he was attentive to all the offices of life. The tenour of his conduct was blameless and gentle. The gravity of his manners was tempered with a wonderful simplicity, and remote from severity. He was easy of access, and treated every one with due respect. To his relations he was very affectionate and obliging; but chiefly regarded and revered his Uncle LÆLIUS. Amongst his female kindred, besides his Grandmother CAMILLA, a most excellent Lady, his Aunt PORTIA and his Sister PHYLLIS shared his most ardent affection, suitably to their peculiar merit*.

ALL

* The former of these Ladies, whilst she lived, was an example of most laudable chastity, and by her discretion and incredible gentleness of manners, so won the affections of LÆLIUS BECCIUS, her husband, a man of rank and fortune, that he would often say with tears, he was

All these past instances of an happy temper and holy regularity of manners, are commendable and engaging parts of a good and great character. But if we estimate the different virtues by the importance ascribed to them in the Christian scheme of morals, or by the circumstances of the virtuous agent, the difficulties he had to surmount, or the alluring temptations he was called to resist; Humility and Patience are the most distinguished of the personal graces in the Character of Socinus.

He had always a very modest, nay debasing opinion of his own abilities and intellectual furniture. "If you would wish to blame any thing in him (saith his BIOGRAPHER) there was nothing afforded so plausible a ground for censure, as his excessive debasement of himself*." Some instances of this have occurred already. And he was disposed to do full justice to the abilities and good qualities of others.

To was unworthy of such and so good a Wife. The latter of them, by the sanctity of her manners and her domestic management, had so gained the approbation of her husband, CORNELIUS MARSILIUS, a Gentleman of high nobility, that her death left in his mind indelible impressions of desire and sorrow.

Vita Socini, p. 6.

* Vitam Soc. p. 6.

To a friend, who had proposed a question relative to the hope of a Resurrection entertained by the PHARISEES, he replies: "This question is very
 " difficult, nor can I think myself the man you
 " reckon me: that any one, much less a man of
 " your great learning and judgment, should apply
 " to me to have his difficulties on any point solved.
 " Nay, in this and most other theological questions,
 " not in general canvassed, I have great need of
 " your assistance and of such as you *." He styles himself THE LEAST OF ALL, writing to the Synod at *Chmelnicia*. "Therefore I, though the least of all,
 " exhort you to be of good courage and in nothing
 " terrified, nor removed from your course and
 " profession, knowing that you are under the protection and guardianship of the Son of God
 " himself, whose cause you plead †."

To a friend, who had expressed a particular regard for his Works, and had suggested a subject on which he wished him to write, he answers: "I
 " doubt not, most honoured Sir, that you have
 " received such an account of me from the Brethren, as will lead you to suppose, it was not
 " through pride, or any contempt of you, that I
 " have not before answered your most obliging
 " letter;

* Opera, tom. i. p. 394. col. i.

† Idem, p. 397. col. i.

“ letter ; it was truly a very different reason. In-
 “ deed I think myself very happy, when an oppor-
 “ tunity offers of writing to and forming a friend-
 “ ship with such, who like you thirst after divine
 “ Truth.

“ Neither on the receipt of your letter, did I
 “ wonder at any thing so much, as that you should
 “ express so great esteem for me, as to write to
 “ me first, and deem my friendship worthy your
 “ seeking. On this account I think myself very
 “ greatly obliged to you. That you will readily
 “ read and examine my Writings, encourages me
 “ to comply with your request ; and if you should
 “ ask any thing else of me, I will endeavour to
 “ gratify you, as far as the powers of my body and
 “ mind, and my other necessary and important en-
 “ gagements will permit. Although in investigat-
 “ ing divine things, I rather want the help of
 “ others, than am able to afford any assistance to
 “ them *.”

In a letter to another he writes thus. “ God
 “ hath given you judgment, learning and elo-
 “ quence, and as I have said before, great influ-
 “ ence among us. Now it is the dictate of Piety,
 “ in which you even greatly excel, diligently and
 K “ vigorously

* Opera, tom. i.p. 459. col. 1.

“ vigorously to employ these gifts to the glory of
 “ God and of his CHRIST, and to lay open daily
 “ more and more the way of our salvation. Fare-
 “ well, most excellent Sir, love me as you used ;
 “ and as I own your kindness in what you write
 “ me, so in return accept mine in what I write
 “ you : and take in good part the freedom of my
 “ admonitions, as I do that of your charges and
 “ reproofs. May God long preserve you for the
 “ glory of his name and the edification of his
 “ Church*.

The following passage in one of his letters,
 breathes the same humble spirit. “ You may see,
 “ distinguished Sir, with what freedom I always
 “ answer you, and discourse with you on the points
 “ about which you write me. And I wish you
 “ would treat me in the same manner, laying aside
 “ all those compliments you use in explaining your
 “ opinions and proposing your doubts. I wish you
 “ to believe me, that I am really conscious to the
 “ poverty of my genius, and that I am convinced
 “ I am not fit to dispute with a man of your rank,
 “ nor to give you satisfaction on such sublime sub-
 “ jects. Nay, I know I ought to be silent, or ask
 “ your pardon for writing and discoursing so free-
 “ ly : so far is it from being proper (as you do from
 “ excess

* Opera, tom. i. p. 402. col. 1. & p. 406. col. 2.

“ excess of modesty) that you should ask pardon of
 “ me for the objections and questions you pro-
 “ pose, by which in fact you do me great honour
 “ and bind me to your service *.”

As SocINUS advanced in life, he appeared to grow still more humble and diffident. About four years before his death he writes. “ Where in my Works I
 “ promised to write concerning the pretended pri-
 “ macy of the *Roman Church*, I do not exactly re-
 “ member; but wherever it was, I perceive that
 “ if I should write on all the subjects which I had
 “ really intended, or which the Brethren desire,
 “ nay continually press me to discuss, I need live a
 “ long term of years, and enjoy a peculiarly good
 “ state of health; but my age and bodily weakness
 “ do not suffer me to indulge the hope of either.
 “ To this let it be added, that the farther I advance
 “ in years and study, the more unfit I find myself
 “ to be for writing and instructing others. There-
 “ fore I would spend the remainder of my days,
 “ not in teaching others, but in learning myself.
 “ Farewell, best and most worthy of men, and my
 “ dearest Brother. Continue your kind regards
 “ to me, and constantly and fervently pour out
 “ your prayers to GOD for me. From the seat of

K 2 “ ABRAHAM

* Opera, tom. i. p. 508. vel F. SocINI ad A. DUDITHIUM, Epist. 12mo. p. 72. *Racoviæ*, 1635.

“ ABRAHAM BLONSCIUS, near *Luclavicia*, April 16,
 “ 1600. I am your most devoted Brother and
 “ Servant in CHRIST. F. S.*”

PATIENCE OF REPROOF is certainly a branch of HUMILITY, and a very important one: and this SOCINUS discovered. To a friend, who not only in the terms of a free admonition, but with some asperity, censured his Answer to PALÆOLOGUS, both his taking this task upon himself, and the execution and spirit of it, he replies in this manner:
 “ I confess not only the first reading of your letter
 “ (as you supposed it would) greatly affected me,
 “ but the last reading of it also; tho’ I have often
 “ perused it with care, and that for many days, before I took up my pen to answer you. Not because
 “ I was displeased at being admonished and reproved by you, from whom I can receive nothing
 “ more agreeable; but because, whilst you do this,
 “ you load me with such immoderate and undeserved
 “ praises, and at the same time severely blame me
 “ for what I am by no means chargeable with,
 “ or seem scarcely to approve what merits your
 “ commendation and praise. You tax me with an
 “ immoderate warmth in this disputation. Here I
 “ ingenuously confess, that I am under the like
 “ obligations to you as to some other friends, who
 “ have

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i, p. 466. col. 2.

“ have sometimes admonished me on the same sub-
 “ ject. In whatever light it may appear to you,
 “ I can seriously declare, that though in the course
 “ of the debate I am often moved to some degree,
 “ yet it always arises from grief, that my adversary
 “ is unwilling, as it appears to me, to acknow-
 “ ledge and embrace the Truth. Otherwise, it
 “ seldom or ever happens, that I am disturbed or
 “ angry. But to what cause soever it be owing, I
 “ will ever thank you for your reproof. For I hope,
 “ by this means, I shall not again incur the charge
 “ of being too warm in a dispute.”

After a particular consideration of the accusa-
 tions and reproofs brought against him by SQUAR-
 CIALUPUS, he adds: “ These are the things,
 “ SQUARCIALUPUS, I think it proper to reply to
 “ your charges and admonitions. I was so far from
 “ sitting down to write these in a passion, that
 “ from the first reading of your letter I have not
 “ been in the least angry with you, nor in any re-
 “ spect slighted your judgment on this matter.
 “ And if by chance you should impute to anger
 “ my strenuous defence of myself, and my detec-
 “ tion of the great mistakes in your advices and
 “ rebukes, you will err much more than I should
 “ were I angry. I shewed yours to some of my
 “ friends, that they might advise me what to do,

“ and in what manner to treat you. They were
 “ greatly displeased. Some scrupled not to say,
 “ it deserved no answer. For, said they, so
 “ busily and warmly to reprove and animadvert
 “ on the studies and labours of another person, is
 “ nothing less than to betray an unfriendly disposi-
 “ tion towards him, or to seek an occasion of a
 “ quarrel, and to try and abuse his modesty and
 “ patience, for the gratification of his own humour
 “ or an ostentatious display of his own parts. But,
 “ as I have said above, I have very different
 “ thoughts of you, and am concerned only on your
 “ own account: although you accuse me of al-
 “ most evident folly and calumny, not to mention
 “ other charges. Here, MARCELLUS, if no where
 “ else, you may perceive my moderation: when
 “ so severely rebuked by you, or rather provoked
 “ by so many reproaches, I have yet answered you
 “ with mildness, and have not declined accounting
 “ for every part of my conduct *.”

To this reply to the severe reproofs of a friend,
 it may be proper to subjoin his answer to the re-
 viling language of an adversary. VOLANUS in
 writing against the sentiments of SOCINUS on the
 Nature of CHRIST, had called him, *A new Anti-*
christ,

* Opera, tom. i. p. 361. col. 1, &c. p. 367. col. 1.
 p. 368. col. 1, 2.

christ, whose mind was agitated by a kind of fury, a Dreamer, an Impostor, by whose assistance Satan would spread a plague over the Christian world, a Man that boldly mangled the Scriptures and rendered them suspected, attempting to draw others to the practice of all impiety, and vomiting out blasphemy, a Madman, a Sceptic, who regarded nothing as certain in Religion and made a sport of the Scriptures, an Inventor of a new kind of childish Logic, a Person void of common sense, who wickedly corrupted the sacred Scriptures and depraved the Doctrine of CHRIST, a foolish Trifler, an odious Prater, one possessed with a virulent and obstinate hatred to CHRIST, the Son of GOD, and to his glory; with many terms and reflections of the same spirit. “ With these
 “ names, and other reproaches of this kind, does
 “ VOLANUS (saith SOCINUS) accost me and en-
 “ deavour to oppress me. But as the living GOD
 “ knoweth that I sincerely forgive these injuries,
 “ and am not at all grieved or affected by them,
 “ except on the account of VOLANUS himself; so
 “ he knows that there is no truth whatever in those
 “ reflections, as I trust they who are acquainted
 “ with my life and manners will believe. Neither
 “ ought VOLANUS indeed to have written in this
 “ bold and shameful strain of a person unknown to
 “ him. But if he should ever know me, I hope
 “ he will confess, that I have erred not through
 “ malice but ignorance, and perhaps will deem me

“ not unworthy of his friendship. I would apprize
 “ VOLANUS, and all others who are displeased
 “ with me for the opinion I defend relative to the
 “ Effence and Person of CHRIST; that whether
 “ they know me or not, by GOD’s help, I will not
 “ be deterred from defending it, by such invectives
 “ and calumnies, nor by the fear of death itself,
 “ unless it be first shewn to be erroneous; which it
 “ can never be. Nay, I am fully persuaded that it
 “ is consonant to Truth, and of the greatest impor-
 “ tance to promote the glory of GOD, and to un-
 “ fold to men more fully the way of Salvation*.”

As a further proof and specimen of his self-com-
 mand, not only under reproaches but heavy suffer-
 ings, I will subjoin the following passage from a
 letter to a friend. “ I doubt not but, according
 “ to your great affection for me, you participate in
 “ whatever befalls me, and I return you my cor-
 “ dial thanks that you have been so ready to con-
 “ sole and encourage me under my heavy cala-
 “ mity. I am indeed, by GOD’s help, every day
 “ more and more confirmed in bearing it patiently,
 “ nay even joyfully. As far as I know, no person
 “ ever treated with that man on my account. Only
 “ when Mr. LUCAS DE PACE heard me relate the
 “ treatment I had received from him, he volun-
 “ tarily

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 422. col. 2.

“tarily offered, because he had some acquaintance,
 “or rather a mere knowledge of the man, to try
 “if he could dissuade him from offering any in-
 “jury to me for the future. This was all I re-
 “garded, having heartily forgiven the ill usage I
 “had already received from him, for which I ne-
 “ver sought the least satisfaction. This he effected
 “the next day, and even brought the man to own,
 “that when he treated me so ill, he was drunk,
 “and if he had been sober would never have be-
 “haved himself so; therefore he begged I would
 “be reconciled to him, as he would be to me,
 “and promised Mr. LUCAS he never again would
 “offer me the least affront; adding his wishes that
 “I would endeavour to remove his Father’s dis-
 “pleasure, who had been long angry with him,
 “especially after he had treated me so injuriously.
 “In this matter I gave him entire satisfaction by
 “letters to our Brethren in the *Vale*, and to his
 “Father, so that I hope his Father, though with
 “much difficulty, was reconciled. Before a day
 “appointed for which reconciliation, he shewed a
 “desire, by asking my pardon, of being first re-
 “conciled to me; and that his reconciliation with
 “his Father might be more easily effected, he
 “begged that the affair might be accommodated
 “in the house of Mr. LUCAS. Upon this being
 “signified to me, I chearfully consented and pro-
 “mised

“mised to go thither on the earliest notice. But
 “whatever was the reason of it, this was never
 “done. I suppose he was ashamed, and thought
 “it was sufficient to procure his Father’s forgive-
 “ness, that I had written to him at his request *.”

Such evidences of humility, patience and a forgiving temper, are furnished by the conduct and sentiments of SOCINUS. The circumstances in which he was placed, at once tried and displayed these virtues. A state of reproach and sufferings provokes resentment and feeds discontent; but it is also the state in which opportunities are afforded to exercise the opposite virtues to the best advantage. A sphere of reputation and influence is apt to swell the mind with ideas of its own importance; but it is also not entirely unfavourable to the cultivation of humility, for he who is attentive to the obligations and duties of it, will feel its difficulties and be led into modest conceptions of his own powers. The man of true piety will preserve his heart susceptible of all the moral impressions, his circumstances have a natural tendency to produce. And the actual display of the very graces his circumstances are suited to exercise and cherish, shews the attention and solicitude of his mind to act upon and adorn the principles of virtue.

But

* Opera, tom. i. p. 456. col. 1.

But besides the honour the Character of SOCI-
 NUS derives from this view of it, and from the
 consideration of the events which rendered these
 branches of Self-government more difficult and
 commendable: in this part of moral conduct he
 had also to contend with his natural disposition,
 “ I cannot easily say (to quote the words of the
 “ *Polish KNIGHT*) whether in so eager a disposi-
 “ tion there were more fire of temper or vivacity
 “ of parts, so prone to choler had nature formed
 “ him, till he had calmed his passions by reason.
 “ Yet he so broke and subdued his choleric tem-
 “ per, that most persons were ready to ascribe the
 “ praise of the mildness that afterwards shone forth
 “ in him to nature and not to virtuous discipline.
 “ The indignities and injuries he suffered, and the
 “ delicate sensibility of his nature, concur to en-
 “ hance and magnify the merit of his patience.
 “ No evil happens to persons of such a frame, with-
 “ out an exquisite sense of pain; nor is it to be much
 “ wondered at, if nobler mental powers be suscep-
 “ tible of greater grief. But in this contest he ap-
 “ peared victorious over his nature and his for-
 “ tune: since with Christian magnanimity of mind,
 “ he met and sustained so many calamities from
 “ strangers, so many injuries from his country-
 “ men, perils from enemies, ingratitude from
 “ friends, envy from the learned, hatred from the
 “ ignorant,

“ ignorant, infamy from all, poverty from fortune,
 “ and from the Church, to which he was an orna-
 “ ment, a continual and ignominious repulse *.”

The views in which we have placed the Character of Socinus, more particularly relate to his conduct as the head and founder of a religious Sect, who disseminated peculiar sentiments, and suffered greatly in the support of them. It may be also proper to see how the principles of Religion operated on him, considered rather as a private Christian.

SECTION V.

The Piety of Socinus.

IT is a sign of the consonancy of Religion to our natures, a proof that not only there is a real foundation for it in our frame ; but that it tends to compleat the most improved and perfect state of which it is capable ; that we expect and discover, and are pleased when we discern marks of genuine and ardent Piety in great characters. Superstition indeed degrades the human mind ; but the veneration

* Opera, vide Vitam Soc. p. 6.

tion and love of supreme excellence and goodness exalts the soul and assists its progress in every kind of moral attainments. Who ever entertained a lower opinion of the respectable and amiable qualities of benevolence and probity, because they were united in the same character with a rational and unaffected devotion to the Father of spirits, the great Author of good? Does it not raise our ideas of these virtues, to see them supported by the principles of a solid piety, and formed after the infinitely perfect model of truth and goodness?

But in persons who have derived a name, reputation and influence from religious pursuits, and by the part they acted in the religious world, we especially look for some evidences of inward, unfeigned and manly piety. Otherwise all the eclat of their characters and influence, was only the transitory glory of the hypocrite or fanatic. And it is not a certain conclusion, that because a man hath pursued, with great assiduity, theological enquiries, and figured in the religious world, that he was actuated by a pure regard to the Deity, and was not led to these studies and to such a part by a merely peculiar mental taste, similar to that which leads some to investigate nature, and others to shine in mathematical science or polite literature.

It is not therefore an unnecessary part of this Work to trace out the Piety of SOCINUS, and to take a distinct view of his character, as formed by the sentiments and influence of genuine and lively regards to the Deity. This hath been partly anticipated under the preceding Sections, particularly when we noticed his Faith and Zeal; this Section shall be employed in setting forth his religious temper in its peculiar expressions, as such a temper may exist, separate from so firm a faith and so ardent a zeal.

It is a main and separate branch of real Piety to be devoted to the will and service of GOD, and to make his glory the end of our pursuits and conduct. As to this point, in reply to his friend who had blamed him for entering into a controversy with PALÆOLOGUS, an adversary of such a kind that there would be no end of the debate; and he would not be able to retreat with any great advantage on his own side, SOCINUS declares, “ I am
 “ very little concerned about these points: and in
 “ engaging in this controversy, as it has been my
 “ custom in all my other actions, the only thing
 “ was, whether what I did were agreeable to GOD
 “ or not; and when I have been clearly satisfied,
 “ that I was not only acting agreeably to the Di-
 “ vine Will, but could not desist from my design
 “ without

“without displeasing the Deity, I have left with
 “God all concern about the issue.”

And further on, in the same letter, “In this
 “also you are mistaken, in supposing that I have
 “been violently carried away to write and publish,
 “by an ardent thirst after virtuous praise, when
 “nothing is more remote from me, than the
 “thoughts of securing praise amongst men. Nor
 “amongst the motives you mention, has any one
 “influenced me but the love of truth. But it
 “particularly affects me, that you entirely pass
 “over in silence the inducement of the salvation
 “of others and the glory of God and CHRIST.”

“And again, you add that you request one
 “thing of me; that I would flatter myself less.
 “This I also know has been the request of some
 “others. But I fear that neither they nor you
 “perfectly know me. For I am very conscious to
 “myself, that I am free from this vice. But I will
 “immediately shew why you and they entertain
 “such sentiments of me; when I have first hinted
 “that, except in the business of Religion, no one
 “will deny that I think humbly enough of myself.
 “But in the affair of Religion it seems the case is
 “otherwise. The reason is, not that I am puffed
 “up with any opinion of myself, or will not acqui-
 “esce

“ else in the better judgment of those who admonish and instruct me; but because, when I am fully convinced that others are still involved in many errors, from which God in his great goodness hath entirely rescued me, and when besides a certain great ingenuity of mind I naturally possess (if I may be allowed to say this of myself) God hath sowed in my heart the seeds of Piety, it necessarily happens that very often, in points of religious debate, I must openly differ from others, and firmly maintain my own opinion: whether I am engaged in advancing my sentiments, or in proving them, or in explaining the sacred Scriptures, or in investigating and illustrating the truth, or in any other way which is connected with the glory of God and CHRIST, and the salvation of souls*.” As the view of SOCINUS, in his disquisitions and publications, appears to have been to promote the honour of God; so we find him ascribing to God any acceptance or success his labours met with: and earnestly imploring that God would smile upon his endeavours, as the greatest favour he could receive. “ God grant (saith he to one friend) that as the style of my writings does not displease you, so the sentiment may meet with your approbation

* Opera, tom. i. p. 364. col. 2.

“ probation *.” And in another letter he writes;
 “ I am truly much rejoiced in hearing what you
 “ write concerning the printing my little piece,
 “ as by this means not only the copies of what I
 “ sent you will be distributed as I requested, but
 “ the reading will be rendered more agreeable to
 “ those Brethren who value the knowledge of the
 “ Truth, I mean that divine Truth which is con-
 “ tained in the Gospel of our Lord JESUS CHRIST;
 “ and that this may at length break forth, I ar-
 “ dently pray God; nor do I any longer despair,
 “ as I used, of this event in our Church. But if
 “ this should happen in my life-time, I should ef-
 “ teem it the greatest instance of divine mercy
 “ and clemency towards me; my sins deserving
 “ that I should die before God bestows on his
 “ Church so great a blessing. I labour indeed to
 “ enjoy this happiness, if God should so favour
 “ me in my life-time. But I do not labour as I
 “ ought, but am slothful and more timid perhaps
 “ than is becoming. I fervently pray that God
 “ would forgive these faults †.”

Another proof of his religious temper arises from the sentiments of resignation he expresses under afflictive and painful events. He was persuaded of

L

“ the

* Opera, tom. i. p. 436. col. 2.

† Idem, p. 427. col. 2.

the wisdom of the divine dispensations, and joined to gratitude for the favours he enjoyed patience under the evils he sustained. When he was afflicted with deafness, at a time that DUDITH had acquainted him with his intention to visit him, he writes, “ Will that desirable day ever shine upon
 “ me? Notwithstanding I am certain, not to men-
 “ tion my inability in other respects, I shall nei-
 “ ther fully enjoy your company, nor you receive
 “ any pleasure from my conversation, on account
 “ of a great deafness GOD hath seen fit should
 “ befall me, probably for my greater benefit, but
 “ which almost entirely incapacitates me for con-
 “ versation *.”

When almost oppressed with grief on account of his wife's death and other events, he says to a friend,
 “ To my wife's death, with which I have been so
 “ deeply affected, that I think but few have felt the
 “ like grief in such circumstances, those public
 “ events, very prejudicial to this kingdom, have
 “ succeeded; which have distressed me not a little,
 “ and do still distress me. It is owing to this that
 “ I have written neither to you nor GADENUS for
 “ a long time, though he has written me often,
 “ scarcely any opportunity of conveyance hath pre-
 “ sented

* Opera, tom. i. p. 497. col. 1. vel Epistolae SOCINI ad A. DUDITHIUM, *Racoviae*, 1635. p. 14.

lication and in his sufferings. In this view it may be proper to relate his account of some violence and indignity offered to him.

“ But I hope God will deliver me from every evil;
 “ yesterday he rescued me from the hands of Mr.
 “ WIERNEK, the Son-in-law of our LIGEZA.
 “ This man, as he was on horseback and attended
 “ with ten or twelve horse, over whom he ap-
 “ peared to command, when I met him here in the
 “ public streets of *Cracow* and was known to him,
 “ ordered his foldiers to seize me by force, and
 “ when I begged he would let me go as an inno-
 “ cent man, he cried that I was an ARIAN and
 “ had seduced his Father, and was not worthy to
 “ live, much less to dwell at *Cracow*, and repeatedly
 “ ordered I should be seized. But when, at my
 “ cries, a number of people came up to us, he
 “ once and again directed them to stop my mouth
 “ with mud, and then to roll me in the dirt; when
 “ no one that stood round us dared to say any
 “ thing to him. At length, I know not how, he let
 “ me go, on condition that I would fall at his feet,
 “ and humbly beg it of him; this I only did in
 “ part, and was let go. Some say he attempted to
 “ run me through with his bayonet, but this I did
 “ not see. Some positively affirm, that when he
 “ dismissed me, and I went into an house to wash
 “ away

“ away the mud, one of the soldiers staid behind
 “ some time, waiting till I should come out, that he
 “ might shoot me. But it was GOD’s will that I
 “ was long employed there in washing myself, so
 “ that he was gone when I came out to go home ;
 “ which as soon as I had reached, I fell upon my
 “ knees and returned thanks for my great deliver-
 “ ance.

“ You will do the same, and exhort the Brethren
 “ whom you can, in my name, to do the like ;
 “ and you will all beg of GOD henceforth to pro-
 “ tect me, and never suffer me, through fear of
 “ death, to do any thing unworthy of the Christian
 “ name. *Cracow, Oct. 7th, 1594*.*”

It is a specimen of the devout turn of his thoughts that SOCINUS frequently begins his epistles with wishing his correspondents “ Salvation and the
 “ Spirit of true Wisdom and Piety from GOD our
 “ Father and from JESUS CHRIST ; Grace and
 “ Peace from GOD our Father and from JESUS
 “ CHRIST ; Salvation and Peace from GOD our
 “ Father and our Lord JESUS CHRIST ; and may
 “ GOD our Father and the Lord JESUS CHRIST
 “ grant you Salvation.” His letters are most com-
 monly concluded either with requesting the Prayers

of his friends for himself, or in pouring out his own pious wishes for them, or with both these expressions of Piety.

For instance: “ I earnestly wish, that in pouring out your prayers to God you would always remember me; that, if possible, I may see you and be comforted by your faith in Christ, and knowledge of divine Truth in its purity. May God assist you all, especially yourself most worthy and accomplished Sir, and more enrich you daily with his gifts*.” To another friend: “ I wish you to convey my best respects to all our Brethren and Sisters, and to beg of them all to persevere in their course with alacrity, and to offer up their prayers continually for the display of divine Truth, and the advancement of the glory of God and of our Lord JESUS CHRIST†. I wish you, most excellent and worthy Sir, the longest enjoyment of safety through our Lord JESUS, and that you may assist the pious, by the knowledge of the Truth, to obtain everlasting happiness. And with much importunity I entreat your prayers, that God may never forsake me under the very heavy temptations that always await me, or permit me to sink under them in
“ the

* Opera, tom. i. p. 374. col. 1.

† Idem, p. 378. col. 1.

“ the least degree. I wholly commend myself,
 “ and you, and the rest of our pious Brethren, to
 “ the grace and goodness of God *. Farewell
 “ my beloved and esteemed Brethren in the Lord
 “ JESUS; whom I sincerely pray to bestow on you
 “ wisdom and unconquerable fortitude of mind
 “ against the power of Satan †. If your Pastor
 “ be returned, as I hope, I desire you would ac-
 “ quaint him, that I put the greatest value on his
 “ prayers for me ‡.” To the Synod at *Chmelnicia*
 thus: “ May God in his goodness be present with
 “ the whole Assembly, and with every individual
 “ of it, both in the Synod and always; nor suffer
 “ any thing to be determined, taught or embraced
 “ by them, that may in any degree obstruct or op-
 “ pose true Piety ||.” To add one more: “ I beg,
 “ my dear SMALCIUS, you will be every day more
 “ persuaded of my affection for you, and that I
 “ continually pray to God to replenish you with
 “ his gifts and be ever with you; which office of
 “ love I justly desire and claim from you in your
 “ turn §.”

L 4

The

* Opera, tom. i. p. 395. col. 1.

† Idem, p. 397. col. 1.

‡ Idem, p. 425. col. 1.

|| Idem, p. 444. col. 2.

§ Idem, p. 467. col. 1.

The Critique of SocINUS on 1 *Cor.* iii. 6, 7. may furnish a suitable conclusion to this Section, and will serve to shew the grounds on which he poured out such devout wishes, and his sense of our dependence on the divine influence and benediction, in endeavouring to promote the knowledge and practice of the Gospel.

“ From the comparison and metaphor it may
 “ be understood, what is that increase **GOD** giveth
 “ to the planting and watering, of which the Apost-
 “ le here speaks. His sole intention is to shew
 “ by this comparison, that all the success attending
 “ the preaching and confirmation of the Gospel,
 “ by the Ministers of **GOD** and **CHRIST**, is to be
 “ ascribed wholly to **GOD**; as the success attend-
 “ ing the planting and watering the husbandman
 “ diligently performeth, is to be wholly ascribed
 “ to **GOD**, from whom proceedeth the energy
 “ which renders these means fruitful. To this
 “ add; as without the heat of the sun, the hus-
 “ bandman’s planting and watering is not sufficient
 “ to yield an increase: so, without divine Grace,
 “ the preaching and confirmation of the Gospel,
 “ by the Ministers of **GOD** and **CHRIST**, is not
 “ sufficient to yield any good fruit. Further, as
 “ the heat of the sun extendeth to every watering
 “ and

“ and planting, and in general to all roots that are
 “ planted and watered ; so this Grace of God is
 “ common to all who by divine Authority preach
 “ the Gospel and confirm its truth, and extends to
 “ all who have it preached and confirmed to
 “ them *.”

* Opera, tom. i. p. 492. col. 2.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER III.

The Sentiments of SOCINUS.

WE are now entering on that part of our Plan which requires peculiar care to preserve Impartiality, Candour and Truth. The Opinions of SOCINUS have been the cause of all the rancour and odium, with which his name and memory have been treated. Party prejudice has given to them a colouring, not the most pleasing and inviting. Many books have been written to hold them up to public detestation. Impiety, Heresy, and Blasphemy, have been charged upon them without reserve. But it is not our business to support their truth on the one hand, or to expose their falshood on the other. We are to enquire what they *were*, with the temper of an Historian, and
not

not to examine them with warmth and bitterness. We are not to *debate* about them, but to *represent* them fairly. It becomes me to treat this subject, and the Reader to attend to it, with as much calmness and indifference as if we had never heard of the admirers or adversaries of SOCINUS. And here, in particular, our authorities must be derived from the words of SOCINUS himself.

For the sake of method I will examine with what temper and dispositions he appears to have pursued his religious enquiries—will then give the Reader a view of his opinions on the main points of theological debate—and subjoin the reflections of some eminent Writers on the scheme of his principles, and a short account of their progress.

SECTION I.

The Temper and Views with which
SOCINUS conducted his Researches.

IT is the reflection of the *Polish* KNIGHT on the unfavourable circumstances of SOCINUS's education, "That perhaps it was expedient a Genius
"born to examine the sentiments of the world,
"should

“ should be tainted with no prejudices, lest it should
 “ receive some seeds of those errors, for the ex-
 “ tirpating of which it grew up. For THEOLOGY
 “ being full of errors infected PHILOSOPHY itself,
 “ and almost all the Arts. And therefore, not
 “ only in the infancy, but also in the childhood of
 “ the world, mankind were misled by the very ru-
 “ diments of learning, and imbibed certain opi-
 “ nions as true, before they could judge whether
 “ they were true or false. Hence it often happens,
 “ that it is better to be seasoned with none than
 “ with erroneous sentiments. Nor is it wonderful
 “ that learned men sometimes shamefully dote,
 “ whilst the unlettered common people judge with
 “ more freedom from prejudice *.”

Though the mind of SOCINUS were not biassed
 by any considerable acquaintance with the learn-
 ing of those times; yet it is supposed to have been
 early prejudiced in favour of a certain set of prin-
 ciples by his Uncle LÆLIUS. But as LÆLIUS ra-
 ther pointed out matters for his investigation, than
 enlarged upon any particular subjects, and lived,
 during the youth of FAUSTUS, out of *Italy*, much
 cannot be ascribed to the influence of his instruc-
 tions and authority. He appears scarcely to have
 done more, than to have raised doubts in the mind
 of

* Opera, tom. i. Vita Soc. p. 3.

Of his nephew and excited in him a spirit of curiosity and inquiry; and these dispositions were afterwards laid asleep for many years, by the engagements and allurements of a Court. When indeed Socinus did apply himself to theological enquiries and disquisitions, he was assisted by the papers of his Uncle; but these furnished rather a guide to his thoughts, than a rule for his belief.

A mind free from any great prejudice, is in a proper situation for the search of truth; but, to be a spur to its inquiries, the love of truth must be felt; and, to preserve it from error, candour and an openness to conviction are necessary. A man cannot profess these dispositions, without being conscious of them; and when he declares that he feels them and is influenced by them, he deserves some credit, for in this matter he is not merely the only but best judge. Let us hear Socinus himself then. We may at least, from what he says, learn what his judgment was as to the best method of investigating the truth, and the means he used to discover it.

“ Let the Truth prevail (says he in a letter to
 “ NIEMOJEVIUS) as you wish in the close of yours.
 “ Which that it may particularly be the case with
 “ respect to ourselves, our greatest care is neces-
 “ sary,

“ sary, as you admonish me, that we be not biassed
 “ by preconceived opinions, nor ashamed to be
 “ admonished and taught by an inferior.

“ That I am not unduly influenced in our dis-
 “ putations by any preconceived opinions, may be
 “ presumed from my diligence in weighing, ex-
 “ amining and answering every argument and con-
 “ sideration offered by you. I do not expect the
 “ same care from you in weighing my reasonings,
 “ because I do not think they are worthy of the
 “ honour; but only such an attention as may be
 “ sufficient entirely to exempt me from the labour
 “ and fatigue of writing and inculcating the same
 “ things, and you also from that of reading over
 “ volumes of mine, in which the same things are
 “ repeated; and especially such as may remove
 “ the suspicion that, through the bias of precon-
 “ ceived opinions, you cannot bear to read, or
 “ cannot understand, or will not examine my ar-
 “ guments*.”

He declares to another correspondent: “ I wish
 “ to be admonished by you and by others, on all
 “ these points in which that Treatise might require
 “ an animadversion, for I find myself most ready
 “ publicly to correct the mistakes which may have
 “ escaped

* Opera, tom. i. p. 423. col. 1.

“ escaped from me. You should not rank me
 “ with those, who, if a man does not enlist himself
 “ under them, or such as they approve, immedi-
 “ ately cry out, HE IS A SEDUCER. I am by
 “ no means one of this stamp. The Book of
 “ SOMNER contains many things not contempti-
 “ ble, and very worthy of the genius and learning
 “ of the Author; but many things also unbe-
 “ coming not only a man of piety, but of acute-
 “ ness and learning. I have indeed freely read
 “ all his writings, for I hoped to have learned
 “ something from them, or to have drawn from
 “ them what might have confirmed what I had al-
 “ ready learned *.”

In another he giveth NIEMOJEVIUS this just
 and important advice, with respect to the investi-
 gation of Truth. “ And since, as it must be clear
 “ to you yourself, our Brethren deservedly hold
 “ you in the highest esteem, and your influence
 “ among us both publicly and privately is very
 “ considerable, I adjure you before GOD and
 “ CHRIST, that it may not be owing to you, if all
 “ salutary Truth do not shine forth, and open on
 “ us all; but that you will use your endeavours,
 “ that elsewhere, and particularly in the Synods,
 “ the questions chiefly connected with religious
 “ Truth

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 392. col. 1, 2.

“ Truth, may be proposed and examined with
 “ calmness and love; not for the sake of con-
 “ demning any particular doctrine, as hath been
 “ preposterously done in the Church hitherto,
 “ but for the sake of discovering the Truth, and
 “ of retaining it when found. Nor be so much
 “ shocked, I pray you, when you hear any thing
 “ affirmed contrary to your opinion and that of
 “ the majority, before it is first understood and
 “ the force of the reasons and proofs duly weighed;
 “ especially as you have already learnt by experi-
 “ ence, that you have at first started back with hor-
 “ ror from those propositions which you have after-
 “ wards cordially embraced. For, to speak the truth,
 “ because you are startled and fly back, if any
 “ one explain, by a meer alteration of the point-
 “ ing, any passage of Holy Writ, different from the
 “ sense you with the generality put upon it, I have
 “ been more backward in performing my promise;
 “ nor could I do it without appearing to you, at
 “ the first view, to corrupt and pervert many pas-
 “ sages of Scripture: which, in fact, I know not
 “ whether any one abhors more than myself*.”

The like just sentiments of candour and pious
 thirst after the Truth, are expressed in a letter to
 a *Polish* Lady, who had written to him about the
 perpetual

* Opera, tom. i. p. 402. col. 1.

perpetual obligation of BAPTISM on the descendants from Christian parents. " I wish there were
 " in our Assembly many women like yourself,
 " who are delighted with sacred things, and the
 " more exact investigation of them; especially
 " amongst those of your rank and condition, Ladies of the Nobility and Mothers of a numerous offspring: for our Church might expect
 " many advantages from hence. Go on in this
 " love of searching after divine Truth; but so,
 " that you examine the force of all reasons and
 " proofs from the Scriptures with the greatest
 " temper and patience; first intreating God to
 " open your mind to understand the things contained in his Word. And as to myself, you
 " may assure yourself, I have no greater care than
 " not to deviate, either to the right hand or the
 " left, from the way which the sacred Books prescribe to us: because I well remember, that
 " nothing must be added to, or taken from, the
 " Word of God and his Precepts; therefore I
 " can by no means approve that any one, who
 " has always professed the name of CHRIST, if he
 " desire to be admitted to the Lord's Supper,
 " should be obliged to be baptized in our Church,
 " since I am fully persuaded this is to add to the
 " Word and Commands of God *."

M

The

* Opera, tom. i. p. 432. col. 2, &c.

The reverent regard for the Scriptures expressed in the last quotation, leads me to produce some passages, as properly falling in with the design of this Section, in which he declares they were the only rule of his Faith, or warmly recommends them in this light to others. Thus in vindication of his Publication against PALÆOLOGUS, he says:

“ As to what you add, that I ought not to publish
 “ any thing, unless it had been well and frequently
 “ considered and examined by the free judgment
 “ of some masters: I know not truly who are these
 “ masters! For with respect to the subjects handled
 “ in my Treatise, I acknowledge no one now
 “ alive as my master in any respect. I regard God
 “ only as my Instructor, and the sacred Scriptures
 “ as my only Guide. Moreover, as to the know-
 “ ledge in divine things I may possess, excepting
 “ my Uncle LÆLIUS, who has been long dead, or
 “ rather except some very few things written by
 “ him, and many hints, I have had no master*.”

Elsewhere he remarks: “ Any one may from
 “ hence see, that the dissensions in the Church have
 “ arisen from this, that most men do not really ad-
 “ here to the Word of God alone. For besides
 “ the sacred Scriptures, I know not what Councils,
 “ Fathers and Antiquity, have been held in the
 “ highest

* Opera, tom. i. p. 362. col. 1.

“ highest veneration, and put on almost an equal
 “ footing with the divine Oracles; when all these
 “ things, and every thing of the kind, ought to
 “ have no other weight with wise men, than as at-
 “ testing the sense of the Church in those times,
 “ or as admonishing them not rashly to depart
 “ from Doctrines which have their seal. But ob-
 “ stinately to persist in any opinions because thus
 “ supported, though the Scriptures evidently con-
 “ tradict them, is nothing better than designedly to
 “ tread under foot divine Truth, and to open the
 “ door to the kingdom of ANTICHRIST. Let
 “ only the Writings of the PAPISTS against the
 “ LUTHERANS and CALVINISTS be read, and it
 “ will be clearly perceived, that if we must rest
 “ upon their authority besides that of the Scrip-
 “ tures, the cause must be given up by us all.

“ But you will say, How do these things con-
 “ cern me? Why: from hence you may see, that
 “ the dissensions now subsisting among the profes-
 “ sors of Christianity, about the Doctrines of the
 “ Christian Religion, have not sprung and arisen
 “ from the obscurity of the divine Oracles, but
 “ from a kind of disregard of them; since the
 “ whole Christian Doctrine is not derived solely
 “ from them: neither should you infer from hence,
 “ that they cannot be sufficiently decided by the

“ authority of the Scriptures; at least you should
 “ not deny that every man may rightly learn, from
 “ these divine Books, the Christian Religion and
 “ its injunctions, so far as is necessary to his being
 “ a Christian.—To these things I more explicitly
 “ add; the way in which the Church was first
 “ built, was by the Word of GOD and CHRIST:
 “ all other things related to the proving the truth
 “ of this. And therefore, since we have now the
 “ same Word of GOD and CHRIST, and that fully
 “ proved, as no one doubts, we really possess at
 “ this day the same means of reforming the Church
 “ by which it was first raised *.”

To the same effect is his reflection on the life
 and conduct of PUCCIUS. “ His end (says SO-
 “ CINUS) should admonish every one of us to ac-
 “ quiesce in the written Word of GOD, and ac-
 “ knowledge it sufficiently plain and clear, in every
 “ point necessary to Salvation †.”

On this head some of the adversaries of SOCI-
 NUS have done him justice. The Author of the
 DICTIONNAIRE DES HERESIES thus speaks of the
 method he took to establish his principles. “ The
 “ pretendly reformed wished to support the Divi-
 “ nity

* Opera, tom. i. p. 381. col. 2. & p. 382. col. 1.

† Idem, p. 380. col. 2.

“ vinity of CHRIST by the authority of the an-
 “ cient Fathers and Councils. FAUSTUS SOCI-
 “ NUS opposed to these proofs all the reasoning the
 “ PROTESTANTS have opposed to the CATHO-
 “ LICS, upon the head of tradition and the Church,
 “ to justify their schism. The Fathers and Coun-
 “ cils (said SOCINUS) might be mistaken, they
 “ were sometimes mistaken. There is no judge
 “ among men endued with a sovereign and infalli-
 “ ble authority to decide matters of Faith; it be-
 “ longs to the Scriptures only to ascertain the ob-
 “ jects of our belief; it is in vain that you cite the
 “ authority of men to convince me about the
 “ most important point of our Religion, the Divi-
 “ nity of JESUS CHRIST*. And a little afterwards:
 “ There is no room to doubt that JESUS CHRIST
 “ was the Person whom GOD sent to accomplish
 “ the Work of the Reconciliation of man, and to
 “ teach them what they ought to believe and do.
 “ It is not less certain, that the New Testament
 “ contains the Doctrine of JESUS CHRIST. In
 “ this Book then we must seek what men must be-
 “ lieve and do to be saved. As there is no infalli-
 “ ble judge or interpreter of the sense of Scripture,
 “ we must endeavour to discover it by the rules of
 “ Criticism and the exercise of Reason. Soci-
 “ NUS and his followers therefore employed them-
 “ selves

* DICT. DES HERESIES, vol. ii. p. 518, 519.

“ selves in searching the Scriptures, for the Sys-
 “ tem of Religion JESUS CHRIST came to teach
 “ men; and it is this which has produced all the
 “ commentaries upon the Scriptures, that form al-
 “ most the whole BIBLIOTHECA FRATRUM PO-
 “ LONORIUM *.”

It is necessary here to take notice of some pas-
 sages quoted from SOCINUS by Dr. WALLIS, in
 order to fix on him the charge of putting de-
 signedly a force on Scripture, and being unfair in
 his enquiries. Dr. WALLIS'S LETTERS TOUCH-
 ING THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, Let. iii.
 p. 47, “ As for me (saith SOCINUS, DE SER-
 “ VATORE, p. iii. l. 6.) though it were found
 “ written in the sacred Monuments, not once but
 “ many times, I would not believe it to be so.
 “ And a little before, having first told us that the
 “ thing was IMPOSSIBLE, he adds: When it doth
 “ plainly appear (*or when he thinks so, whatever all*
 “ *the world think beside*) that the thing cannot be,
 “ though the divine Oracles seem expressly to at-
 “ test it, *it must not be admitted*; and therefore the
 “ sacred Words are, even by unusual tropes, to be
 “ interpreted to another sense than what they
 “ speak. To this I say, either SOCINUS was a gross
 “ HERETIC, or an Apostate from Christianity; or
 “ those

* DICT. DES HERESIES, vol. ii. p. 520, 521.

“ those who have furnished Dr. WALLIS with these
 “ quotations are as gross falsifiers: for I cannot
 “ suspect that Dr. WALLIS himself would forge
 “ such calumnies to blacken another man, espe-
 “ cially a noble person, long since dead, and who
 “ never did him any injury. The very words of
 “ SOCINUS are these: Nonnulla in ipso (nempe
 “ CHRISTO) reperta sunt quæ ejusmodi satis-
 “ factionem penitus excludunt. Quare nequeo
 “ satis mirari, quid eis in mentem venerit, qui no-
 “ bis primi istam satisfactionem fabricarunt. Cum
 “ ea quæ fieri non posse aperte constat divinis
 “ etiam oraculis ea facta fuisse in speciem diserte
 “ attestantibus, nequaquam admittantur (et idcirco
 “ sacra Verba in alium sensum quam ipsi sonant,
 “ etiam per inusitatos tropos explicantur;) nedum
 “ tunc pro compertis & plane veris affirmantur
 “ atque aliis obtrudantur, cum ne verbum quidem
 “ in universis sacris Literis de ipsis extet: nam si
 “ unus saltem locus inveniretur, in quo satisfactionis
 “ pro peccatis nostri DEO per CHRISTUM exhibitæ
 “ mentio fieret, excusandi fortasse viderentur. Ego
 “ quidem etiam si, non semel sed, sæpe id in sacris
 “ Monumentis scriptum extaret; non idcirco tamen
 “ ita rem prorsus se habere crederem ut vos opi-
 “ namini. In *English* thus: There are some things
 “ in our Lord JESUS CHRIST which plainly ex-
 “ clude such a satisfaction. Wherefore I cannot

“ sufficiently wonder what was in their minds, who
 “ first devised THAT satisfaction. Those things of
 “ which it is manifest that they cannot be, are not
 “ admitted (*he means by interpreters and commentators*)
 “ though the Scriptures do, *as it were, seem* to affirm
 “ them expressly; (and therefore the sacred Words
 “ are, even by unusual tropes, interpreted to ano-
 “ ther sense than what they sound;) much less are
 “ they affirmed for apparent and plain truths or forced
 “ upon others, when there is not a word about them
 “ in the whole Scripture. For if even but one text
 “ were found, in which there were mention of sa-
 “ tisfaction made to GOD for our sins by the Lord
 “ JESUS CHRIST, they might perhaps be excused.
 “ For my part, though IT (*HE MEANS THIS WORD*
 “ SATISFACTION) were extant in Scripture, not
 “ only once, but many times, I would not for all
 “ that believe THE THING to be altogether so AS
 “ YE HOLD IT. These last words are left out in
 “ the Doctor’s *Latin* quotation, and in his transla-
 “ tion; and what SOCINUS plainly intended of the
 “ custom and manner of interpreters or commen-
 “ tators, that the Doctor represents as SOCINUS’s
 “ private sentiment, and the rule of interpreting
 “ by him only used and advised. But any one who
 “ understands *Latin*, and reads SOCINUS’s own
 “ words at length, which I have before repeated,
 “ will see SOCINUS meant only thus much: This
 “ word

“ word Satisfaction is no where extant in holy
 “ Scripture ; and if it were, yet we need not there-
 “ fore believe the vulgar Doctrine about the sa-
 “ tisfaction : both because there are in the Lord
 “ CHRIST himself, several things which exclude
 “ such a satisfaction ; and because all interpreters
 “ have recourse to (even unusual) tropes, when the
 “ Scriptures seem to affirm things which would be
 “ manifestly false, if we interpreted them by the
 “ meer sound of the words. I suppose SOCINUS
 “ might have in his thoughts, *that rock was CHRIST,*
 “ 1 Cor. x. 4. *I am the living bread which came down*
 “ *from Heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall*
 “ *live for ever,* John vi. 51. or such like texts ; in
 “ which it cannot be denied that the tropes are
 “ harsh and unusual in the Western languages,
 “ though they were not so in the Eastern. Lett.
 “ iii. p. 4. They are SOCINUS’s own words, (Epist.
 “ ad BALCEROVIC. Jan. 30, 1581.) The con-
 “ trary opinion (with AUGUSTIN’s leave, and
 “ others of his mind) seems to me so absurd and
 “ pernicious, that we must rather put *a force*, how
 “ great soever upon PAUL’s words, than admit it.
 “ At Lett. iv. p. 2. and often elsewhere the Doc-
 “ tor repeats these words, as if they were spoken
 “ of the Doctrine of the Trinity. But the thing
 “ is not so. The question touched in that letter,
 “ is whether the context of Rom. vii. 14. and *I*
 “ *am*

“ *am carnal, sold under sin, &c.* is to be understood
 “ of PAUL himself, and every other regenerate
 “ person or not? SOCINUS denies they are spoken
 “ of PAUL, or other regenerate persons, and adds
 “ that a force (how great soever) is rather to be
 “ used, than to admit such a pernicious error;
 “ that is, than admit that St. PAUL, or a regene-
 “ man, is CARNAL, SOLD UNDER SIN, &c. These
 “ words are indeed *hyperbolical*, but considering the
 “ occasion, capable of (and intended in) an ho-
 “ nest sense, as any candid man will acknow-
 “ ledge *.”

These remarks seem sufficient to obviate the
 above objection; the passages admit a fair vindica-
 “ tion. SOCINUS asserts nothing in them, but
 what is allowed and practised by all judicious in-
 terpreters of Scripture, who always have recourse
 to a figurative and more lax sense of those passages,
 which otherwise assert things derogatory to the di-
 vine perfections, impossible and absurd. There is
 no other way of evading the force of the PAPISTS
 argument for TRANSUBSTANTIATION from the
 express words of the institution, or of avoiding
 those gross and unworthy conceptions of the Deity,
 held forth in the obvious and literal meaning of
 those

* UNITARIAN TRACTS, vol. i, p. 294, 295. Lond.
 1691. 4to.

those texts which ascribe *eyes, hands, ears, and human passions* to God. Indeed that interpretation of a text which preserves its consistency with the dictates of reason and other texts, is the just and plain sense of the words; though it may appear at first forced and strained, because foreign to the false and absurd ideas early bias and custom have made habitual, and as it were natural to the mind.

Thus far we are led to form a favourable opinion of the manner in which Socinus applied himself to discover the Truth. What could be said more truly or more like a Protestant, than the sentiments in some of the preceding passages. They breathe a good spirit, and carry with them evident marks of ingenuity, candour, and seriousness of mind. If, with these dispositions so favourable to truth, he fell into material errors, errors fatal to Salvation, he at least ceases to be the object of our anathemas and hatred; he is entitled to our generous pity. And let every one who thinketh he hath the Spirit of Truth, and knoweth the great Doctrine of the Gospel, take heed lest he should fall into any gross delusions and errors. If it were the case of this man, who is there whom it doth not become to be diffident, modest and candid?

But

But we will proceed to consider what was the result of his enquiries, and the scheme of religious principles he formed for himself.

SECTION II.

The Opinions of Socinus.

THE following Quotations from the Works of Socinus will serve to give the Reader a faithful view of his general scheme of Principles, and of his ideas and conceptions on particular points.

I. A SUMMARY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

“ THE Christian Religion is an heavenly Doctrine, teaching the true way of attaining to eternal Life.

“ This way is only obedience to God, agreeable to the precepts he hath given us by our Lord JESUS CHRIST, *Heb. v. 9.*

“ But to obtain a clear view of the requirements of God, we must first consider the nature
“ and

“ and condition of man, and in what rank and
 “ state he appears before God.

“ Man, because he is made out of the earth,
 “ *Gen. ii. 7. 1 Cor. xv. 47.* is naturally mortal,
 “ *Gen. iii. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 48.* and liable to cor-
 “ ruption; and, through his violation of a divine
 “ precept, became obnoxious to eternal death;
 “ *Gen. ii. 17. iii. 19.* so that, with respect to im-
 “ mortality, he hath no fellowship with God; and
 “ is, moreover, by his sins become the enemy of
 “ God.

“ It is therefore necessary, in order to his being
 “ restored to the divine favour and raised to the
 “ hopes of immortality, that God should forgive
 “ all his sins, and, having changed his nature,
 “ should rescue him from the bondage of death.

“ Now God, from his pure goodness and mercy,
 “ hath determined to do both these things, *2 Tim.*
 “ *i. 9. Tit. iii. 5.* if man repent of his past sins,
 “ and for the future regulate his life, not by a car-
 “ nal and earthly, but by a spiritual and heavenly
 “ rule.

“ It nevertheless pleaseth God, for the more
 “ open display of his Goodness and Power, *2 Cor.*
 “ *iv.*

“ iv. 7. and for the trial of our faith and obe-
 “ dience, 1 *Pet.* i. 7. not immediately to deliver
 “ us from death, but that we should first pass
 “ through it; and, if necessary, endure it even in
 “ the most cruel forms by which it can be inflicted
 “ upon us, rather than again offend him.

“ Since then GOD requireth something to be
 “ performed on the part of man, that he may be
 “ engaged to accomplish his own purposes; it is
 “ not only necessary that this counsel of heaven
 “ should be revealed to him, but that he should
 “ be convinced and satisfied that such is really
 “ the design of GOD.

“ It therefore pleased GOD to send into the
 “ world his best beloved Son CHRIST JESUS, born
 “ of a woman, *Gal.* iv. 4. to publish to us these
 “ glad tidings, *Mark* i. 38. *Luke* iv. 43. *John* iii. 37.
 “ nay to confirm, seal and verify them.

“ And thus CHRIST coming into the world, hath
 “ announced to us those counsels of GOD, *Eph.*
 “ ii. 17. *Luke* iv. 18. 2 *Tim.* i. 10. *Heb.* ii. 3.
 “ *Isa.* lxi. 1. He confirmed his discoveries by nu-
 “ merous and most incontestable miracles, *John*
 “ ii. 23. vii. 3. xii. 37. *Acts* ii. 22. He sealed his
 “ doctrine by his own blood, *Heb.* xiii. 20. *Luke*
 “ xxii.

“ xxii. 20. *Mark* xiv. 24. *Heb.* xii. 24. on this account
 “ willingly submitting to a most cruel and ignomi-
 “ nious death, *John* x. 18. and lastly, he exem-
 “ plified in his own person the way to eternal life,
 “ which we ought in the present state to follow,
 “ *John* xiii. 15. 1 *Pet.* ii. 21. 1 *John* ii. 6.

“ Being moreover raised from the dead by God
 “ the Father, *Gal.* i. 1. *Acts* iii. 13. 1 *Theff.* i. 10.
 “ that he should live for ever, *Rom.* vi. 9. *Acts*
 “ xiii. 34. *Heb.* vii. 24, 25. iv. 14. vi. 20. He
 “ hath fully proved to us, 1 *Pet.* i. 3, 4. *Heb.* x.
 “ 19, 20. iv. 14. vi. 20. that they who pursue
 “ this course, to whatever evils or perils they may
 “ be exposed, shall at length rise to that everlast-
 “ ing life, which God hath promised us by him.

“ Especially as God, to lay the firmest founda-
 “ tion for our faith in this promise, hath not only
 “ raised JESUS CHRIST from the dead to an im-
 “ mortal existence, but hath also conferred on
 “ him all power in heaven and earth, *Matt.*
 “ xxviii. 18. *John* xiii. 3. *Eph.* i. 20. This investi-
 “ ture with universal power, after CHRIST was
 “ taken up into heaven, in the sight of his beloved
 “ disciples, *Acts* i. 9. *Luke* xxiv. 51. *Mark* xvi. 19.
 “ was proved by the wonderful works performed,
 “ and the heavenly gifts bestowed, in the name of
 “ JESUS

“ JESUS CHRIST, *Mark* xvi. 20. *Heb.* ii. 4. *Acts*
 “ iv. 10, The consequence of this is, that God
 “ hath given to him authority and power to raise
 “ us from the dead, and to grant us immortality,
 “ *John* v. 20, 21, 26. vi. 39, 40. *Phil.* iii. 21.
 “ as into the hands of our brother, who himself
 “ endured those very evils which we suffer, *Heb.*
 “ ii. 11, 17. *Psf.* xxii. 22. *John* xx. 17. *Heb.* iv.
 “ 15. so that we can entertain no doubt of his
 “ sympathy with us, *Heb.* ii. 18. iv. 15. and of
 “ his giving us that life God hath granted him
 “ the power to bestow on those who tread in his
 “ steps, *John* x. 27, 28. xviii. 2.*”

II. ON THE DUTY OF A CHRISTIAN.

“ IF a Christian, by the grace of God, be so
 “ free from some vices, that if the incentives and
 “ opportunities which betray men into the prac-
 “ tice of them offer, he can preserve himself un-
 “ contaminated by them ; it ought to be his dili-
 “ gent care, first giving God thanks, to persevere
 “ in this state, nor to be even diverted in the
 “ least degree from that virtuous conduct. His
 “ next care should be, to consider whether there
 “ be not other vices to which he is more inclined,
 “ so that it is very possible he may fall in some de-
 “ gree

* *Opera*, tom. i. p. 281,

“ gree into them, unless he be very watchful; if
 “ he discover this, it is his duty either to avoid
 “ all the occasions of these crimes, or if that can-
 “ not be done, to resist all the temptations to these
 “ vices, as he would his worst and most cruel ene-
 “ mies. He ought not to think he has attained
 “ any excellence of character, because he was not
 “ overcome in circumstances that scarcely required
 “ any resistance, unless he also come off victorious
 “ over those temptations that demanded a vigo-
 “ rous and active opposition, and called for the
 “ exertion of all his strength of mind, in concur-
 “ rence with the help of God; for whose assist-
 “ ance he should apply by constant prayer.

“ If when we are exercised by any severe trial,
 “ and our resolution begins to fail, any one should
 “ seriously admonish us of our duty and reprove
 “ our indolence, we should by no means fly to such
 “ pleas as this; that a person in health may easily
 “ give advice to the sick: but we ought thankfully
 “ to acknowledge the truth of his admonitions,
 “ and to own that we shall act an unworthy part,
 “ if we do not obey them with all the care and
 “ readiness our weakness will allow*.

N

III,

114 * Opera, tom. i. p. 781. col. 1.

III. ON THE DEATH OF CHRIST AND ITS EFFICACY; HIS POWER, MEDIATION, AND NATURE.

“ It is my judgment that CHRIST was a Man,
 “ *Rom.* v. 15. conceived and formed in the womb
 “ of the Virgin, without the intervention of a man,
 “ by the power of the divine Spirit, *Matt.* i. 20,
 “ 23. *Luke* i. 35. and that being thus born, he was
 “ at first capable of suffering and mortal, *2 Cor.*
 “ 13, 4. till having discharged here on earth the
 “ duty assigned him by God, he afterwards af-
 “ cended into heaven and became immortal, and
 “ no longer liable to sufferings, *Rom.* vi. 9.—The
 “ divine Sonship of CHRIST can be referred to
 “ his nature, only so far as it relates to this, that
 “ CHRIST was formed in the womb of the Virgin,
 “ without the instrumentality of a man, by the di-
 “ vine Power. For the Angel foretold to the
 “ Virgin, of whom he was born, that on this ac-
 “ count he should be called the Son of God, *Luke*
 “ i. 35. and of consequence his own and only be-
 “ gotten Son; as no other person ever was the
 “ Son of God in the same way, by the immediate
 “ origin of his being.

“ But

“ But JESUS is thus stiled principally, because
 “ he is the person whom his name indicates him
 “ to be, namely CHRIST. JESUS is a name appli-
 “ cable to him merely as a man; but CHRIST is
 “ the name that points out the great eminence and
 “ excellence of character conferred on him by
 “ GOD; for the word, GOD, is every where to be
 “ understood after it, as if it had been expressly
 “ written, THE CHRIST OF GOD. This eminence
 “ arose from his being the King of GOD’s people.
 “ Kings were appointed over his people, and
 “ anointed by a divine ordinance; therefore they
 “ were called the *anointed* of GOD, or his CHRISTs,
 “ for this is the import of the name CHRIST. This
 “ name which was in some sense applicable to
 “ them, was applicable to JESUS in the most pro-
 “ per and absolute sense; and had a force, when
 “ given to him, not belonging to it when bestowed
 “ on them. For JESUS was, in the highest, truest,
 “ and most peculiar sense, the KING OF GOD’S
 “ PEOPLE.

“ He possessed an absolute power over them,
 “ which no earthly King has over his subjects and
 “ their concerns. How many subjects escape from
 “ the hands of their King, who wishes to punish
 “ them! How many the evils which threaten the
 “ King himself from his subjects, which he cannot

“ avoid! How many the inconveniences earthly
 “ Kings may wish to avert and remove from their
 “ subjects, but are unable to do it! How many
 “ the benefits they would desire to confer, but
 “ have them not in their power! And, not to
 “ mention more particulars, earthly Kings have
 “ no power over the will and minds of their sub-
 “ jects; which yet, in the conduct of men, are of
 “ more consequence than the external actions.
 “ But all these things, in which earthly Kings are
 “ deficient, are possessed by JESUS CHRIST.

“ As to the opinion commonly received, that
 “ CHRIST is the only begotten of God, because
 “ he, and no one besides him, was begotten of the
 “ divine Substance, I regard it as a mere human
 “ invention, *i. e.* not by any means agreeable to the
 “ sacred Scriptures, which make no mention of
 “ any generation from the substance of God him-
 “ self; and as entirely repugnant to sound reason,
 “ which abhors the thought of God’s begetting
 “ from his own substance like corruptible animals,
 “ or that the individual and simple essence of God
 “ should be divided or multiplied, or, that remain-
 “ ing entire and numerically one, it should be
 “ common to many.

“ To

“ To this let it be added, that the Scripture
 “ plainly explains the true and divine Filiation of
 “ CHRIST, as we just now shewed, when we spoke
 “ of his conception in the womb of the Virgin;
 “ and expressly uses as synonymous the phrases,
 “ *Jesus was the Christ, and Jesus was the Son of God,*
 “ *Matt. xvi. 16. Mark viii. 29. Luke ix. 20. Matt.*
 “ *xxvi. 63. Mark xiv. 61. Luke xxii. 67, 69. John*
 “ *xx. 31.* Hence it appears, because JESUS was not
 “ the King of the people of GOD, and so the
 “ CHRIST in the highest and most absolute sense,
 “ till after he arose from the dead, that it was said
 “ he was constituted the Son of GOD by his Resur-
 “ rection from the dead, and was then begotten by
 “ GOD when GOD raised him from the dead, *Rom.*
 “ *i. 4. Acts xiii. 33.**

As to those passages of the NEW TESTAMENT,
 which are generally supposed repugnant to the
 above sentiments of SOCINUS, because they seem
 plainly to assert CHRIST'S existence in the heavenly
 world, previous to his birth and appearance amongst
 men, SOCINUS, besides explaining them distinctly,
 has thus in general expressed what he apprehended
 was the sense they would in common fairly admit.

N 3

“ These

* Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 654. col. 1, 2.

“ These passages might refer to a prior exist-
 “ ence, if they could not be applied to CHRIST
 “ as a man. Nothing is more probable and more
 “ agreeable to the very words of CHRIST here and
 “ elsewhere, than that CHRIST himself, after he
 “ was born, and before he entered on the Office
 “ assigned him by his Father, was, in consequence
 “ of the divine counsel and agency, in heaven, and
 “ remained there for some time; that he might
 “ hear from GOD, and being with him, as the
 “ Scripture says, might see those things he was to
 “ announce and lay open to the world, in the name
 “ of GOD himself. The words of CHRIST himself,
 “ *John* iii. 13. vi. 62. are spoken of him as Man,
 “ or the Son of Man,

“ And if any one will only attend to what hap-
 • “ pened to MOSES, before the whole Law was
 “ promulged by his Ministry, and that the form
 “ and materials of the different pieces of work-
 “ manship belonging to the worship of GOD, be-
 “ fore they were executed, were prescribed to
 “ MOSES by GOD, he will immediately own (espe-
 “ cially as it appears, from other considerations,
 “ that MOSES was the type of CHRIST) that no-
 “ thing can be conceived more suitable, than that
 “ CHRIST, before the time we speak of, should
 “ have ascended into heaven to GOD, and perhaps
 “ more

“ more than once, and have abode there for some
 “ time. For MOSES, before the first promulga-
 “ gation of the Law, it is said, ascended to GOD
 “ upon Mount *Sinai*, as a careful Reader will ob-
 “ serve, three times, *Exod.* xxiv. 18. xxxi. 18,
 “ xxxii. 15, 16, 19. xxxiv. 4, 26. and remained
 “ there with GOD forty days and forty nights; and
 “ this twice, namely, when the two tables were
 “ first given, and again after the two former tables
 “ had, in resentment against the idolatry of the
 “ people, been thrown down and broken by him,
 “ when he received two others like them, which
 “ he carried to the people, and afterwards repo-
 “ sited in the ark of GOD, *Exod.* xxv. 16.

“ For it is very clear, that as CHRIST was the
 “ antitype to MOSES, so Heaven was to Mount
 “ *Sinai*; moreover this very Mount, on account
 “ of the Presence which was manifested there, was
 “ in those times called Heaven. MOSES plainly
 “ says, that the voice which came from the moun-
 “ tain, and was heard by the people, was heard
 “ out of Heaven, *Deut.* iv. 36.

“ The reason this ascent of CHRIST into heaven,
 “ and his abode there before he began to discharge
 “ his office on earth, are not mentioned in the
 “ History of the Gospels is obvious; because it

“ was an event of that kind, that it was not, nor
 “ could be clearly seen by any one. The first three
 “ Evangelists do not record any words of CHRIST
 “ himself, or of any other person, from whence
 “ this event may be learnt, when yet the fourth and
 “ last of the Writers, *i. e.* JOHN, ch. iii. 31, 32.
 “ gives us many speeches of CHRIST himself, and
 “ some of JOHN THE BAPTIST, from which it may
 “ be concluded; if these words are to be under-
 “ stood literally and according to their sound, as
 “ they ought, if they do not clearly admit another
 “ interpretation. The Evangelist, when he could
 “ not offer more proofs of this fact, thought it suf-
 “ ficient to establish the faith of it, and supposed it
 “ would be deemed so by all, to relate the express
 “ testimonies of CHRIST himself on the point. If
 “ any one is not convinced by these, the testimony
 “ of the Evangelist himself would not produce the
 “ least conviction of it *.

“ The name of CHRIST, denotes his office as
 “ our eternal High-priest and also his prophetical
 “ Character, on account of which, it is our opi-
 “ nion, he is called the Word of GOD: for it was
 “ customary to anoint both PRIESTS and PRO-
 “ PHETS, *Exod.* xxix. 7. *1 Kings* xix. 16. and the
 “ term CHRIST signifies properly ANOINTED.

“ The

* Opera, tom. i. p. 675. col. 1, 2.

“ The eternal Priesthood of Christ, is his office
 “ and perpetual care for expiating our sins ; and
 “ CHRIST expiates our sins, as he frees us from
 “ the punishment of them.

“ This deliverance from the punishment of
 “ our sins has nothing in common with a satisfac-
 “ tion for them, but is rather repugnant to it.
 “ Forasmuch as we are thus saved from the pu-
 “ nishment of our sins by CHRIST, because by his
 “ great power in heaven and earth he brings it
 “ about, that no proper punishment shall reach us ;
 “ and by the same power will accomplish our en-
 “ tire and perpetual freedom from death, *Phil.*
 “ *iii. 21.* which is the wages of sin, *Rom. vi. 23.*
 “ and its principal and peculiar punishment. But
 “ this method of rescuing us from the punishment
 “ of our sins, is very different from that which im-
 “ plies a satisfaction for them.

“ To this let it be added, that on this account
 “ CHRIST possessed the right of exerting his power
 “ to deliver us from the punishment of our sins, in
 “ the way we have said ; because God hath
 “ FREELY pardoned and forgiven our sins by him,
 “ *Rom. iii. 22. Eph. iv. 34.* But nothing can be
 “ more repugnant to each other, than a *free Pardon*
 “ and

“ *and Satisfaction.* Indeed no man of judgment and
 “ piety, ought to entertain the idea of a SATIS-
 “ FACTION for sin; since it plainly does very much
 “ derogate from the power and authority, or good-
 “ nefs and mercy of GOD.

“ Nay, it neither ever has nor ever can be the
 “ case, that any one should be delivered from the
 “ punishment of his sins, by the efficacy of a SA-
 “ TISFACTION. For the divine justice can by no
 “ other means be satisfied, than by the sinner's suf-
 “ fering the punishment of his sins; but every one
 “ will perceive, that to suffer the punishment of
 “ our sins, and to be exempted from the punish-
 “ ment of them, are totally irreconcilable to each
 “ other. Neither can one person suffer punish-
 “ ment for another, as one may pay the money
 “ another owes; for punishment cannot, like mo-
 “ ney, be transferred from one to another. For-
 “ asmuch as money, to use the style of Lawyers, is
 “ somewhat real, and can therefore be transferred;
 “ but punishment which we here speak of, and
 “ which according to the Law of GOD is due to
 “ the sins of men, is something personal; and
 “ therefore of such a nature, as always to adhere
 “ to the person who suffers it, and does not admit
 “ of being transferred to another.

“ To

“ To this let it be subjoined, that God himself
 “ hath expressly forbidden, that one should be
 “ put to death for another, though nearly related,
 “ *Deut.* xxiv. 16. *2 Kings* xiv. 6. and hath most
 “ plainly declared, that he will by no means do
 “ this, *Ezek.* xviii. 20.

“ Hence it appears, how possible soever this
 “ might be in other cases, to be repugnant to di-
 “ vine justice itself, that one should suffer punish-
 “ ment (and death is the greatest penalty) for the
 “ sins of another: so far is it from being true, that
 “ the divine justice can be satisfied for sin in this
 “ way.

“ It is evidently impeaching the Majesty of God
 “ to suppose that he cannot, that is, hath not the
 “ right to forgive sin freely; for thus he would
 “ possess less authority than any man does, as there
 “ is no one who cannot justly pardon freely any
 “ offences committed against him. And what are
 “ our sins, but offences committed against the Di-
 “ vine Being? To say God is unwilling to do this,
 “ doth most evidently depreciate, if not entirely
 “ destroy his goodness. And although a PROPI-
 “ TIATION be not the same thing as a SATISFAC-
 “ TION, and although God never refrained from
 “ the punishment of sin, on account of any real
 “ satisfaction

“ satisfaction given him, but, on the contrary,
 “ by the prayers of his servants, and by other
 “ considerations, which have appeased his anger,
 “ hath often been induced to dispense with the
 “ punishment of it; yet it is certain, that in re-
 “ mitting the punishment of our sins by JESUS
 “ CHRIST, not any propitiation offered to the an-
 “ ger of God by any one, not even by CHRIST
 “ himself, intervened; but God hath, from his
 “ free-will, exhibited himself so propitious to us in
 “ CHRIST, as not to exact the punishment of our
 “ sins, though he might have done it with the
 “ strictest right or equity.

“ Three things are signified by God’s being pro-
 “ pitious to us in CHRIST JESUS. First, That God
 “ hath, by JESUS CHRIST, announced, testified
 “ and confirmed this his own free and voluntary
 “ propitioufness to us and our sins. Secondly,
 “ That it is necessary, if we would be partakers
 “ of this great blessing, to be in CHRIST, and be
 “ members of him by faith, and by the same spi-
 “ rit of obedience which he possessed. Thirdly,
 “ That God causeth us to experience all the ef-
 “ fect of this his own propitioufness by CHRIST,
 “ and by him alone carrieth it on to its last and
 “ most perfect issue and end.

“ That

“ That GOD was not in the least made PROPITIOUS or appeased by CHRIST, but was of his own free-will propitious to us in him, is clear from this. First, That CHRIST is never, in the sacred Scriptures, said to appease GOD. Besides we there read, that GOD, because he loved us, sent CHRIST into the world, *1 John iv. 10.* and that CHRIST *visited us according to the tender mercies of GOD, Luke i. 78.* and many other passages from which it is plainly concluded, that GOD was propitious and benevolently disposed towards mankind, before CHRIST began to enter on his office. To this add, that the forerunner of Christ, during the period of his ministry, preached the Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins; from whence it appears, there was no necessity, that CHRIST should appease GOD, or that, on that account, a decree to forgive sins, and the publication of that decree, should take place.

“ And indeed CHRIST himself, when he proves, *Luke iv. 21.* that the prophecy of ISAIAH, ch. lxi. belonged to him, plainly instructs us in the opening of it, that his office was not by any means to appease GOD, that so we might obtain the remission of our sins; but on the contrary, in the very entrance of it, to preach liberty to

“ the

“ *the captive, and the acceptable year of the Lord, i. e.*
 “ JEHOVAH. And what else was it to preach the
 “ Gospel of the Kingdom of God, which Christ
 “ immediately did when he began to teach, and
 “ which he declares he was sent to do, but this
 “ very preaching of forgiveness of sin to the peni-
 “ tent? For the Evangelist expressly asserts, that
 “ Repentance was preached by CHRIST from the
 “ beginning, *Matt. iv. 17. Mark i. 15.*

“ When the Apostle PAUL often speaks of re-
 “ conciliation being made by CHRIST, it means
 “ that God hath reconciled us to himself by
 “ CHRIST, as the Apostle himself says, *2 Cor. v.*
 “ *18.* nor do we ever read that CHRIST recon-
 “ ciled God to us. Hence it appears, that this re-
 “ conciliation made by CHRIST was no other thing,
 “ than that we who were, as the Apostle says, the
 “ enemies of God, *Rom. v. 10.* were prevailed
 “ upon to become the friends of God, *i. e.* to de-
 “ sist from offending him, and so to obtain the for-
 “ giveness of sin offered by God himself, and be
 “ received into his favour*.”

“ The title MEDIATOR, which is applied to
 “ CHRIST, signifies one who is a Messenger and
 “ Interpreter between two parties; who is not of
 “ one

* Opera, tom. i. p. 665. col. 2.

“ one only, as the Apostle says, when he speaks of
 “ Mediator, *Gal. iii. 20.* but must be of two. Since
 “ then the two parties, whose Messenger and Inter-
 “ preter CHRIST is, are God and Mankind, there-
 “ fore he is called the Mediator of God and Man.
 “ Hence, not because CHRIST made peace between
 “ God and Man, but because he was sent from God
 “ to Men, to explain the will of God himself to
 “ them, and to make a covenant with them in the
 “ Name of God, therefore CHRIST is said to be
 “ the Mediator between God and Man *.”

“ If we consider the derivation of this word
 “ MEDIATOR, which is evidently deduced a MEDIO,
 “ from being in the middle, certainly as CHRIST is
 “ now a middle person between God and Man, i. e.
 “ as God executes and performs all things relative
 “ to his people, *1 Cor. viii. 6.* and in their turn
 “ they always come unto God by him, *Heb. vii. 25.*
 “ there can be no doubt but that CHRIST now dis-
 “ charges the duty and office of a Mediator of
 “ God and Man. But yet the sacred Scriptures,
 “ when they call him Mediator, seem not to refer
 “ to this, but to those things mentioned above, de-
 “ noting indeed by that name our approach unto
 “ God; but not, as he now abides in heaven, a
 “ middle person between God and his People, but
 “ as

* Opera, tom. i. p. 666. col. 2.

“ as he was so on earth. For CHRIST, as Media-
 “ tor, is compared with and clearly preferred in
 “ the sacred Books to MOSES, *Heb.* viii. 5. who was
 “ also a Mediator, *Gal.* iii. 19. because MOSES re-
 “ vealed the will of GOD concerning his People,
 “ though not completely, nor without shadows and
 “ a veil, *John* i. 17. *Heb.* vii. 19. x. 1. *2 Cor.* iii. 13.
 “ and entered with them, in the name of GOD, into
 “ the old Covenant, which was to vanish away, *Heb.*
 “ viii. 9, 13. *2 Cor.* iii. 14. But CHRIST hath most
 “ plainly and perfectly unfolded the doctrine, which
 “ it was the will of GOD *should* be preached to men
 “ in his name, *John* i. 1, 18. *2 Cor.* iii. 14, 16, &c.
 “ *Col.* ii. 9. *2 Cor.* iv. 4. *John* xiv. 9. *Heb.* i. 3. or
 “ CHRIST was the most perfect interpreter of the
 “ divine will to men; and he hath enacted and
 “ established with men, in the name of GOD, a new
 “ Covenant, *Heb.* ix. 15. xii. 24. which will not
 “ cease as long as the world endureth, *Heb.* xiii. 20.
 “ *Rev.* xiv. 6. and in the future world, will be at-
 “ tended with eternal consequences, *Dan.* ix. 27.
 “ *Mark* xiv. 14.*

“ The death of CHRIST is a sufficient proof of
 “ the love of GOD to us, and greatly illustrates it,
 “ if this event were any way connected with our
 “ salvation and deliverance from the punishment
 “ of

* Opera, tom. i. p. 666. col. 2,

“ of sin, although it were not absolutely necessary
 “ that CHRIST should die. But it seems particu-
 “ larly and chiefly necessary, that Christ should
 “ undergo a violent death, because they whom he
 “ came to save are often exposed to such a kind of
 “ death.

“ The faithful servants of CHRIST are possessed
 “ of eminent probity and innocence, and it is not
 “ lawful to revenge themselves. The first of these
 “ things, in its natural tendency, is the occasion
 “ of their being hated by all men and consequently
 “ cruelly harassed by them, and easily delivered
 “ up to death on any pretence and opportunity ;
 “ the latter consideration powerfully urges the
 “ wicked to this, as it affords them an easy advan-
 “ tage for effecting their measures *.

“ AS CHRIST is the Saviour of those who be-
 “ lieve in him, there were therefore two reasons
 “ why it was necessary he should die a bloody
 “ death. First, that by his example he might ex-
 “ cite and encourage them to persevere in the way
 “ of salvation, on which they had entered. The
 “ second is, that he is the person who befriends
 “ and assists them in all dangers and temptations,
 “ and at last rescues them from eternal death.

O

“ But

* Opera, tom. i. p. 667. col. 1, 2.

But how could CHRIST have induced and ani-
 “ mated his disciples by *his* own example, always
 “ to maintain that eminent probity and innocence
 “ without which they cannot be saved, unless he
 “ had tasted the cruel death which certainly attends
 “ it? Or how could he exercise that great care of
 “ strengthening them in their sufferings and of de-
 “ livering them from all evils, unless he had fully
 “ experienced how severe and intolerable to hu-
 “ man nature they were in themselves*.

In some other places SOCINUS thus expresses his
 ideas about the efficacy of the death of CHRIST.

“ Although JOHN the BAPTIST, when he ascribes
 “ to CHRIST the taking away sin, hath called him a
 “ *Lamb*, and in that mode of expression, without
 “ doubt, alluded to the expiatory sacrifices, yet I
 “ do not apprehend that by this language he refers
 “ only to the sacrificing of a Lamb, or to CHRIST
 “ as so sacrificed, but to CHRIST in his whole cha-
 “ racter, who in many ways takes away the sins of
 “ the world. It may be alledged as a proof of
 “ this, that in the expiatory sacrifices of the Law,
 “ which were expressly offered for sin, no Lamb
 “ was sacrificed. From which it appears, when
 “ the BAPTIST called CHRIST a *Lamb*, he had a
 “ reference

* Opera, tom. i. p. 667. col. 2.

“ reference to something else besides those sacri-
 “ fices, and had respect to the purity, innocence
 “ and meekness of CHRIST, and designed in some
 “ measure to represent the office of CHRIST in
 “ general by that metaphor; especially when, as
 “ we said, CHRIST took away sin, not only by the
 “ sacrifice of himself, but by many other ways.

“ For CHRIST took away sin, *i. e.* wrought out
 “ our exemption from the punishment of it; as
 “ he was the first since the beginning of the world,
 “ who in the Name of GOD offered the pardon of
 “ all sins, even the most heinous, to all who should
 “ repent according to his directions, and con-
 “ firmed these overtures by an everlasting cove-
 “ nant. CHRIST takes away sin, because he allures
 “ and has power to engage men, by heavenly and
 “ most sublime promises, to practise that repen-
 “ tance by which their sins will be blotted out.
 “ CHRIST takes away sin, because he hath not
 “ only taught the method of their being blotted
 “ out; but hath also proved the infallible truth of
 “ his doctrine by many, and those very amazing,
 “ evidences. CHRIST takes away sin, because he
 “ hath the power of remitting the sins of whomso-
 “ ever he pleaseth; either on earth, as he could
 “ even when he was yet mortal, or even in hea-
 “ ven, which he was authorised to do after he was

“ made immortal : although this last case in some
 “ measure belongs to his offering or sacrifice of him-
 “ self, by which he became immortal and obtained
 “ the highest power.

“ Moreover, CHRIST takes away sin, because,
 “ separately from the offering of himself, he pre-
 “ vails with us by the efficacy of his doctrine, and
 “ the wonderful confirmation it received, to for-
 “ sake our sins. And, to omit other considera-
 “ tions, CHRIST takes away sin, because he excites
 “ all who are not past recovery, by the example of
 “ his own most pure life, to leave their sins and
 “ cordially to pursue sanctity and righteousness.

“ Therefore, as we have said, not only on ac-
 “ count of his being a sacrifice, did JOHN call
 “ CHRIST *the Lamb of God*, who would take
 “ away the sins of the world, not on this account
 “ only did he by the use of this name allude to the
 “ expiatory sacrifices of the Law ; but chiefly on
 “ account of that taking away of sin, which, as we
 “ have seen, might properly be ascribed to CHRIST
 “ before he was sacrificed. For PETER also,
 “ 1 Epist. ch. i. 19. calls him a *Lamb*, when yet he
 “ is not speaking of his blood poured out as a sa-
 “ crifice for our sins, but as the price by which the
 “ persons, to whom he wrote, were redeemed from
 “ their

“ their vain conversation received from their fa-
 “ thers; because as by the sacrifice of any cattle
 “ sins were taken away under the Law, so, if by
 “ the influence of the blood of CHRIST, we be
 “ rescued from our vain conversation, our sins are
 “ removed from us; and thus CHRIST is tacitly
 “ compared with those victims, and called a *Lamb*,
 “ not principally on account of his being a sacri-
 “ fice, but because he taketh away sin *.”

To these passages it may be proper to subjoin
 two or three others, in which he endeavours to re-
 move the imputations thrown on his sentiments
 concerning the death of CHRIST. Speaking of
 himself in the third person, he writes thus: “ He
 “ (*i. e.* FAUSTUS SOCINUS) does not despise the
 “ wisdom, nor treat with contempt, the Word of
 “ GOD, because he does not acknowledge that jus-
 “ tice operated in union with divine mercy, in the
 “ salvation obtained for us by CHRIST, if by jus-
 “ tice is meant GOD’s rigour in punishing sin.
 “ For GOD, by delivering CHRIST to death, did
 “ not at the same time shew himself severe and
 “ merciful towards our sins, but merciful only;
 “ since our sins are not blotted out by the death
 “ and blood of CHRIST, as by a way in which they
 “ were punished; but because CHRIST, by his
 “ death

O 3

* Opera, tom. i. p. 591. col. 2. p. 592. col. 1.

“ death and the pouring out of his blood, entered
 “ into heaven, where he became an eternal HIGH-
 “ PRIEST, *i. e.* obtained power to rescue us for
 “ ever from death and the other penalties of sin;
 “ and thus became the Author of eternal salva-
 “ tion to all that obey him, *Heb. v. 9.* Nor does
 “ he entertain the same sentiments of the death of
 “ CHRIST, as far as it relates to the blotting out
 “ of our sins, as of the death of JOHN the BAP-
 “ TIST, of PAUL, and other Martyrs; none of
 “ whom obtained by their death a power to de-
 “ liver us from death, which yet we acknowledge
 “ CHRIST did.

“ Neither does he place the words of PETER,
 “ who promised to lay down his life for CHRIST, on
 “ a level with the declaration of CHRIST himself,
 “ saying, *I am the good Shepherd, and lay down my*
 “ *life for the sheep:* but, by quoting the words of
 “ PETER, he proves that the phrase of *laying down*
 “ *our life for any one*, does not signify dying that
 “ persons sins may be blotted out, unless that some
 “ other expressions determine this to be the mean-
 “ ing of it. He alledges them to shew, that from
 “ these words alone his hearers could not perceive
 “ that CHRIST would die to blot out their sins, for
 “ which purpose the passage was quoted. Not that
 “ he (*i. e.* SOCINUS) denies that CHRIST died for
 “ this,

“ this, *viz.* that our sins might be blotted out, but
 “ *confesses it, and glories in it as a most certain truth.*

“ Therefore he readily allows not only that the
 “ death of CHRIST, and the pouring out of his
 “ blood for us, was an offering and sacrifice to
 “ GOD, for a sweet-smelling savour, as PAUL ex-
 “ presses himself; but moreover that this sacrifice
 “ may be said to have been offered up for our
 “ sins, *i. e.* for this end, that our sins and iniqui-
 “ ties might be purged and forgiven: although the
 “ sacred Scriptures, as far as his offering and sa-
 “ crifice was not only of a sweet-smelling savour
 “ to GOD but expiatory, assert that CHRIST of-
 “ fered himself to GOD not on the cross, as is the
 “ opinion of most men, but in heaven itself after
 “ his resurrection. Nor is this surprising, since he
 “ did not obtain eternal Redemption before he en-
 “ tered into the holy place, not made with hands,
 “ and there assumed the Priesthood, as is the doc-
 “ trine of almost all the Epistle to the *Hebrews*;
 “ and without a Priesthood no expiatory offering
 “ could be made. Therefore FAUSTUS owns, that
 “ our happiness and justification proceeds from
 “ the death and resurrection of CHRIST, as ex-
 “ plained above *.”

O 4

SOCINUS

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 444. col. 2.

SOCINUS when he is treating of the divine and sovereign power with which CHRIST is invested, observes; “ That the passages which ascribe this
 “ power to him, are too numerous and too expli-
 “ cit to admit of any figurative sense, from which
 “ it might be inferred that he did not really pos-
 “ sess such great power. For instance (says he)
 “ when CHRIST declares, *John v. 22, 23. The Fa-*
 “ *ther judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment*
 “ *to the Son; that all should honour the Son, even as*
 “ *they honour the Father:* the words so plainly and
 “ emphatically attribute a divine and sovereign
 “ power to CHRIST, as to leave no room for any
 “ figurative sense.

“ The words *judging* and *judgment* every one
 “ knows, according to the *Hebrew* idiom, include
 “ the idea of rule and government joined with
 “ jurisdiction. To omit other places, they who
 “ preside over the people by the exercise of rule
 “ and jurisdiction, are stiled *Judges of the earth,*
 “ *Psalms ii. 10.* and GOD himself, on account of
 “ his government of the whole world, which is
 “ connected with the highest jurisdiction, is de-
 “ scribed by the character of *the Judge of all the*
 “ *earth,* *Genesis xviii. 25.* That these words of
 “ CHRIST ought to be understood in this exten-
 “ sive sense, and do not merely point out the office

“ and

“ and act of passing sentence, and are much less
 “ to be referred only to his power of judging the
 “ world in the last day, is clearly proved by the
 “ words immediately following those just cited,
 “ viz. *That all men should honour the Son even as they*
 “ *honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son,*
 “ *honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.* For
 “ this plainly shews, that the real and ample ho-
 “ nour we are bound to render to CHRIST, is here
 “ treated of, and consequently the grounds of this
 “ honour, which must now be actually and fully
 “ existing.

“ And this demonstrates, that the ground upon
 “ which CHRIST is to be honoured by all men, is
 “ the greatest and most distinguished of those pre-
 “ rogatives which the Father himself possesseth,
 “ and which can by any means be communicated
 “ to another ; otherwise it could not be justly
 “ concluded, that this honour should be like to
 “ that paid to the Father. Hence it necessarily
 “ follows, that *the all judgment* which CHRIST de-
 “ clares was given to him by the Father, must sig-
 “ nify that government of all men (for of them
 “ without doubt CHRIST speaks) which is any
 “ way connected with his kingdom and empire
 “ united with the highest power and jurisdiction ;
 “ and such as the Father possesseth, who does not
 “ now

“ now exert it in his own Person and by himself im-
 “ mediately, but in the person and by the agency
 “ of CHRIST.

“ Many other passages plainly assert this sove-
 “ reign power of CHRIST. The very name CHRIST,
 “ which chiefly denotes his kingly character, ex-
 “ presseth the same idea; for a kingdom cannot
 “ subsist without the possession of full and absolute
 “ power. And by no means can it be supposed,
 “ that this name signifies a future kingdom, to be
 “ hereafter possessed by CHRIST: for the Scrip-
 “ ture testifies, that CHRIST now sitteth on the
 “ throne of his Father, and is at the right hand of
 “ GOD, *Rev. iii. 21. Rom. viii. 34.* This *sitting at*
 “ *the right hand of GOD*, plainly describes the so-
 “ vereign power, which GOD does not now exer-
 “ cise by himself but by CHRIST; and remarkably
 “ agrees with the passage already explained by me,
 “ that *the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed*
 “ *all judgment to the Son*, and is explained by it.
 “ And is there any one that does not perceive,
 “ that the right hand denotes the place of greatest
 “ honour * ?”

I find SOCINUS further explaining his ideas on
 the subject of CHRIST's power, and of its extent,
 in

* SOCIN. Opera, tom. i. p. 668, col. 1, 2.

in a Letter to a Friend who seems to have mistaken what he had advanced on the point.

“ As my opinion expressed in the disputation
 “ with FRANCIS DAVID (and which is to be met
 “ with in that with CHRISTIANUS FRANKEN, and,
 “ if my memory do not fail me, in that with AN-
 “ TIVUJEKUS) viz. that the dominion of CHRIST
 “ extends only to the Church, does not meet with
 “ your entire satisfaction: you should consider
 “ that, from more places than one, it is evident I
 “ mean to include all things that have, or can
 “ have, any even remote connection with his
 “ Church and the individual members of it; so
 “ that I comprehend in my words those things
 “ which, out of the Church, have yet a respect to
 “ it. For there is no one thing (though you seem
 “ to think otherwise) which may not have some
 “ relation to the Church. Nay, the things that
 “ may have such an influence are infinite, as you
 “ yourself must of course confess, if you consider
 “ the extent of this earth, or rather of the uni-
 “ verse, and the events that daily take place in it.

“ For have I any where either tacitly or ex-
 “ pressly denied, that our daily bread, necessary
 “ for the support of life, is to be asked from
 “ CHRIST, provided he who solicits it, or he for
 “ whom

“ whom it is requested, or the prayer itself, has
 “ any connection with or relation to the things we
 “ speak of. And as to the great inconveniency
 “ you apprehend from the notion that GOD exer-
 “ cises part of his authority by himself, without
 “ the mediation of CHRIST, and part by the agency
 “ CHRIST, I truly can see no inconveniency or ab-
 “ surdity in it; nay, in my opinion, all the impro-
 “ priety and absurdity lies on the other side. I
 “ trust the matter will appear in the same light to
 “ every one who entertains the same sentiments
 “ with us, about the nature and essence of CHRIST,
 “ if he be careful to preserve the prerogative of
 “ GOD the Father, and attend to the reason why
 “ he hath invested CHRIST with so great power*.”

To these passages I would subjoin his reasoning
 on this subject against PALÆOLOGUS, who it seems
 had asserted, that the government of the Church,
 as well as the world, had been resigned by CHRIST,
 since his death, unto the Father, and that CHRIST
 does not himself direct the concerns of his king-
 dom. To expose and refute this notion, he writes
 thus.

“ I say your opinion, that CHRIST does not in
 “ the present time administer himself the affairs of
 “ his

* Opera, tom. i. p. 472. col. 1, 2.

" his kingdom, may be charged with manifest
 " falshood, on the authority of the Revelations;
 " in almost the whole of which Book, but espe-
 " cially from the end of the first to the beginning
 " of the fourth chapter, CHRIST is introduced as
 " taking care of the Church, and exercising the
 " power he hath in heaven and earth *.

" From the repugnancy of your sentiment to
 " itself, its falshood will clearly appear. For you
 " either grant CHRIST's care of his kingdom be-
 " fore the destruction of *Jerusalem*, or you do not.
 " If you do not grant it, how can those things be
 " true, which in many places you strongly urge?"

SocINUS then quotes some sentences from his
 opponent, and proceeds: " But if you allow
 " CHRIST's care of his kingdom before the de-
 " struction of *Jerusalem*, as is very plain; for what
 " reason should you deny it after this, and assert
 " that he has resigned it to his Father? Is it be-
 " cause CHRIST has perhaps since removed to some
 " remote place, from whence he be not able to
 " govern his kingdom, or is so engaged in other
 " concerns as to have no leisure for this office?
 " Or does he sleep during this interval? For I

* Opera, tom. ii, p. 110. col. 2.

“ cannot imagine you will be so mad, as to say
 “ that he is again dead.

“ But if CHRIST be not removed to any distant
 “ place, from whence he cannot himself govern
 “ his kingdom; if he be not hindered by other
 “ engagements; if, lastly, he live for ever, and
 “ be not fallen into inactive sleep, it is most weak
 “ to suppose that he hath resigned his kingdom to
 “ the Father, especially when the sacred Scriptures
 “ say not a word of this.

“ To shew that no place is so remote, from whence
 “ CHRIST cannot administer the concerns of his
 “ kingdom amongst us, it is sufficient to observe, he
 “ formerly directed them when bodily absent from
 “ a place, and that his bodily presence is by no
 “ means necessary for this management of it. It
 “ must be resolved into the divine power granted
 “ to him. But a power of this kind is not to be
 “ confined or limited to any part of space. This
 “ same power also reminds us, that there can be no
 “ other engagement so great, for which CHRIST
 “ cannot be at leisure, without laying aside the
 “ government of his kingdom. Though nothing
 “ can be conceived more absurd, than the ima-
 “ gination that CHRIST should cast off the care of
 “ his

“ his kingdom, to be at liberty to attend to other
 “ affairs. Neither do you mean this: since you
 “ you assert that he now reposes in inactivity.

“ Some one perhaps may say for you, that CHRIST
 “ indeed does govern his kingdom; but it is that
 “ which he hath in heaven, and he cannot direct at
 “ the same time the concerns of that on earth. How
 “ ridiculous this supposition is, any one may easily
 “ judge for himself, or from what hath been ad-
 “ vanced; especially since the kingdom CHRIST
 “ possesseth in heaven, hath an intimate relation to
 “ the government of that on earth, and that he
 “ might direct the latter, GOD the Father invested
 “ him with the former.

“ Further, that CHRIST is now alive, and is always
 “ wakeful and active, no one will deny, who recol-
 “ lects the words of the Author of the Epistle to the
 “ *Hebrews*, viz. that CHRIST is *able to save to the ut-*
 “ *termost them that come unto GOD by him, seeing he*
 “ *ever liveth to make intercession for them*, ch. vii. 25.
 “ and who hath read the many other passages in
 “ this Epistle, which demonstrate that CHRIST is,
 “ and will be for ever, acting in heaven, ch. ii. 17.
 “ iv. 15, 16*.

“ I say

* Opera, tom. ii. p. III. col. 1, 2.

“ I say then that your opinion is highly impious,
 “ or, as I have expressed it before, very injurious
 “ to GOD and his CHRIST ; because it plainly sub-
 “ verts the most excellent work of GOD, in which
 “ his kindness and beneficence to the human race
 “ peculiarly shine forth, and robs CHRIST of his
 “ most distinguishing prerogatives and glory. For
 “ in what hath GOD displayed so great benignity
 “ and liberality to men, as in appointing the Man
 “ JESUS of *Nazareth*, who is called CHRIST, to
 “ be the Captain and Prince of all who lead an
 “ heavenly life on earth, and thus strive for im-
 “ mortality ; and in investing him with such great
 “ power, that he can protect and rescue all such
 “ persons in this life from every injury, and all the
 “ snares of Satan and the world ? And what can be
 “ conceived more suitable or honourable to CHRIST
 “ himself, than that residing in heaven he rules
 “ and governs his Church on earth, and ought to
 “ be continually adored by them, and with confi-
 “ dence invoked in all their necessities ? But there
 “ is an end to all this, if at present the administra-
 “ tion of his kingdom by himself be not allowed to
 “ him, and it be supposed that he lives in a state of
 “ inactivity and repose *.”

From

* Opera, tom. ii. p. 112. col. 2.

From this review of the Sentiments of SOCI-
NUS on the Character and Office of JESUS CHRIST,
it is time to proceed to a survey of his Opinion
on other THEOLOGICAL Points.

IV. HIS SENTIMENTS ON THE DIVINE PER- FECTIONS, THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN, THE FALL, PREDESTINATION, AND JUSTIFI- CATION.

1. His notions and reasonings on the Perfec-
tions of GOD, may be learnt from the following
passages in his second Dialogue between a Pupil
and his Master. Under the latter character he says
to the former: " You ought to consider that the
" Eternity of GOD is necessarily and plainly in-
" cluded in the notion of his self-existence and
" sole divine dominion over us. For this implies
" and is almost expressly to assert, that he has no
" beginning. For to possess divine dominion from
" himself alone, is nothing else but to possess it
" from his own nature, and to derive it from no
" other being. But it necessarily follows, that he
" who possesseth any thing from his own nature,
" and not by derivation from another, hath himself
" no beginning: otherwise he does not possess it
" naturally, but by communication; and if so, not
" from himself, but from another communicating

“ it to him. But if this hold with respect to all
 “ other things, how much more ought it to be al-
 “ lowed just as to the divine empire, and those
 “ things of which any one is the sole possessor,
 “ when the divine empire can neither be acquired
 “ by his own strength, nor from any other quar-
 “ ter. For there can be no doubt, if God pos-
 “ sess divine empire from himself, and indeed
 “ he alone doth so, he could have no beginning,
 “ but hath always been; and will have no end,
 “ but will exist to all eternity *.

“ Unlimited and infinite Power, Wisdom and
 “ Goodness also belong to the divine Essence.
 “ Under goodness I include what also others do,
 “ justice, or rather rectitude, and equity; and by
 “ wisdom I mean a knowledge of and acquaintance
 “ with things. Before I enlarge on these Attributes
 “ I must shew how it necessarily results from the
 “ idea of God's being possessed of a divine em-
 “ pire over us solely, and from himself, that these
 “ attributes are in him supreme and unlimited.
 “ And it follows thus; the Being who possesseth
 “ such an empire, must necessarily be the most
 “ perfect Existence, since he is by nature supreme
 “ over all, and consequently all his attributes must
 “ be perfect and supreme, and he can be deficient

“ in

* SocINI Opera, tom. i. p. 682. col. 2.

“ in no one excellence. Therefore, as power, wis-
 “ dom and goodness are excellencies, it is not
 “ only necessary that all these should dwell in him,
 “ but even be supreme and perfect *.”

To the question proposed by the Pupil, what he
 thought of the Plurality of Persons in the divine
 Essence, he replied: “ I cannot but think as the
 “ divine Essence is numerically one, there are not
 “ many divine Persons, but one only. For we
 “ have no authority of reason or Scripture to sup-
 “ pose that should take place in the divine Essence,
 “ which can by no means happen in any other.

“ To have clear conceptions on this head, you
 “ must rightly understand what is *numerical Essence*,
 “ and what is meant by the word *Person* in this
 “ dispute. Numerical essence therefore, and such
 “ all confess is the divine Essence, is that which is
 “ most properly called essence, some single indivi-
 “ dual nature, which subsists by itself. By the
 “ word *Person* (for this word is rather more fit to
 “ denote some other ideas) we here understand
 “ likewise a single individual thing, subsisting by
 “ itself, and moreover what is endued with intel-
 “ ligence. So that there is no other difference

P 2

“ between

* Opera, tom. i. p. 682. col. 2. p. 683. col. 1.

“ between numerical essence and person, than that
 “ every person is numerically an essence, but not
 “ every essence numerically a person. For there
 “ must needs be added, to what is otherwise suffi-
 “ cient to constitute a numerical essence, Intelli-
 “ gence, that it may be a person.—When there-
 “ fore it is most certain, that a numerical essence
 “ endued with intelligence differs nothing from a
 “ person, it of course follows, that if there be many
 “ persons in God, there are also many numerical
 “ essences in him ; which every one will conceive
 “ and confess is most absurd and impious*.

With respect to the Immenfity of God, SOCINUS
 expreffeth himfelf thus. “ On this point I ad-
 “ vance nothing fingular befides this, that I do
 “ not fee the neceffity, as is generally thought, that
 “ becaufe the power of God is immense, his ef-
 “ fence alfo is immense. For the immenfity either
 “ of his power, or of any of the attributes of God,
 “ is not of the fame kind as that which is afcribed
 “ to his effence, and of which we are now speak-
 “ ing. For the latter relates to quantity, if it be
 “ proper to fpeak thus when difcourfing of the
 “ Divine Being ; but the former relates to quality.
 “ And if any one were to meafure the ftrength,
 “ for

* Opera, tom. i. p. 684. col. 1, 2.

“ for instance, or any other quality of any animal
 “ by the quantity in size of the animal, he would
 “ be deservedly laughed at.

“ But perhaps it will be urged, that nothing in-
 “ finite can arise from what is finite ; since, as it
 “ is generally said, there is no proportion between
 “ finite and infinite. To this I answer, that the
 “ divine Power itself, of which, by way of exam-
 “ ple, we are now expressly treating, is so infinite,
 “ or as we have before termed it, uncircumscribed
 “ by any limits, that it reaches to all things possi-
 “ ble to be done, without exception. For there
 “ are some things that are by no means possible to
 “ be effected : such are all things, as we have be-
 “ fore hinted, which imply a contradiction ; for in-
 “ stance, what is commonly alledged in the theo-
 “ logical schools, *That what is done, cannot be undone.*
 “ To these things all grant the power of God doth
 “ not extend, from which it is clear the power of
 “ God is not so infinite, that there should be no
 “ proportion between that and the essence of God,
 “ from whence it proceeds, although the essence of
 “ God be not immense ; for such an immensity
 “ shews an infinity, according to its kind, most
 “ complete in all points.

“ But it is not my intention to persuade you,
 “ that the essence of God is not infinite, when my
 “ own opinion is not settled on this point. But
 “ my only view is to shew you, that from the sen-
 “ timents which I think are to be entertained con-
 “ cerning the nature of God, *viz.* That his power
 “ and knowledge are not circumscribed within
 “ any limits, it is not a necessary consequence, that
 “ the essence of God is infinite; and a person
 “ may not approve of the notion that the essence
 “ of God is infinite, and yet have no doubt about
 “ other things relative to the essence of God, and
 “ necessary to be embraced*.”

2. It was the opinion of Socinus, that the first Man was naturally mortal, by which he did not mean, that from the first moment of his creation he was necessarily subject to death, but only that he was liable to it through the nature of his frame, and could not have been for ever exempted from death, without an exertion of the divine favour and influence, which was not granted him at creation†. He argued this point largely in his disputation with Puccius, and briefly defends it in his Theological Lectures.

He

* SocINI Opera, tom. i. p. 685. col. 1, 2.

† Idem, tom. ii. p. 258. col. 1, &c.

He endeavoured to support it by arguments drawn from the power with which man was endued of increasing and multiplying, whereas the immortal do not beget children—from the use of food, which an immortal frame does not require—from his body being of the animal kind, which is mean and corruptible, and evidently different from a spiritual and immortal body—from being indulged the use of the tree of life, which would be useless for an immortal nature—from the existence of all the causes that lead to death, before man sinned—and from his being earthly, because formed of the earth, and as earthly mortal, 1 Cor. xv. 47. Therefore when the Apostle asserts, that by sin death entered into the world, he means not natural mortality, but death itself or the necessity of dying. “ For Adam, if he had not sinned, “ (says SOCINUS) might have been preserved from “ death by the kindness of GOD, though naturally “ mortal; or, if he had died, have been restored “ again to life, and made immortal. By his sin “ he did in a manner refuse to give himself and “ his posterity this blessing. Therefore, unless the “ favour of GOD be renewed to us, we must all “ die and remain in the state of the dead. Nei- “ ther can he, who will be recalled again to life, “ so properly be said to die, as to sleep and take

“ his rest. Therefore sin is the cause, not of mortality, but of actual death *.”

3. WITH respect to the power of Man to discover, by the light of nature, the Being of God, and the Truths of what is called natural Religion, SocINUS thought that these principles were above his natural powers; and that the first notices of a Divine Being, were derived from Revelation, or immediate communications from God. His view of the subject will be learnt from these passages.

“ It is an opinion (says he) commonly embraced
 “ in the present day, that the idea of a Divine
 “ Being is natural to man and innate to his mind;
 “ the idea of a Being by whose power all things
 “ are ruled and governed, and who exercises in
 “ particular a care and providence over mankind.

“ This opinion, which we regard as false, seems
 “ to have arisen from no other source than this,
 “ that all men appear to be furnished with these
 “ ideas of a Divine Being. But it is to be ob-
 “ sidered, that in the very beginning, when man
 “ was created, God revealed himself to him; and
 “ as this first man lived nine hundred and thirty
 “ years

* Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 537. col. 1.

“ years, he could easily instil into his posterity
 “ some notion of the Divinity. Although there
 “ was no need of this, since God revealed him-
 “ self in various methods, not only to the first
 “ man, but to those that sprang from him, as
 “ clearly appears from the sacred History*.

“ There are some who will say, that at least it is
 “ indisputable that, from the frame of this world,
 “ whoever applies his thoughts may not only dis-
 “ cover the being of a God, but learn that he in-
 “ spects human concerns. Nay many add, that
 “ from the same frame all may sufficiently under-
 “ stand, whatever is necessary to that knowledge
 “ of God, from which all Religion proceeds.

“ The falshood of this opinion is evinced by
 “ this; that the most excellent Philosophers, and
 “ among them ARISTOTLE in particular, who ap-
 “ pears to have surpassed all in the penetration of
 “ his genius, not only saw the frame of the world
 “ as well as the rest of mankind, and with many
 “ others contemplated it; but even diligently
 “ searched into and examined the universe and
 “ all its parts, and yet could not arrive at this
 “ point, even to the supposition that God took
 “ care of the lowest particular parts of it, or to
 “ perceive

* Opera, tom. i. p. 537. col. 2.

“ perceive his Providence over the individuals of
 “ mankind. Nay, they could not attain to this
 “ truth, that the world was created by GOD, but
 “ even denied it *. But some persons will say,
 “ How could men live holily, according to the
 “ precepts of GOD, if they did not naturally know
 “ GOD? I answer: that GOD from the begin-
 “ ning, both before and after the Flood, revealed
 “ himself to men, so that they might sufficiently
 “ discover him and his will. If therefore after-
 “ wards they were destitute of this knowledge, it
 “ arose from their own fault, who suffered the di-
 “ vine Light to be by degrees diminished and
 “ lost †.”

It may perhaps agreeably relieve the attention
 “ of the Reader, in this review of the Sentiments
 “ of SOCINUS, to introduce here a paragraph or
 “ two from the great and good Dr. HARTLEY’S
 “ OBSERVATIONS ON MAN on the same subject.

“ To deduce (says this distinguished Writer)
 “ the existence and attributes of GOD, even in a
 “ very imperfect manner, from natural Phæno-
 “ mena, requires, as it seems to me, far more
 “ knowledge and ratiocination, than men could
 “ have

* Opera, tom. i. p. 538. col. 1.

† Idem, p. 538. col. 2.

“ have for many generations from their natural
 “ powers; and that especially, if we suppose lan-
 “ guage not to be inspired, but attained in a natu-
 “ ral way.

“ It will be found very difficult by such persons
 “ (*i. e.* who are acquainted with antient history)
 “ to account even for the Pagan Religions, with-
 “ out recurring to such Patriarchal Communica-
 “ tions with God as are mentioned in the Penta-
 “ teuch, and to the more full Revelations to the
 “ Jews. So that one is led to believe, that all that
 “ is good in any Pagan or false Religion, is of di-
 “ vine original; all that is erroneous and corrupt,
 “ the offspring of the vanity, weakness, and wick-
 “ edness of men: and that, properly speaking, we
 “ have no reason from history to suppose that
 “ there was any such thing as meer natural Reli-
 “ gion, *i. e.* any true Religion, which men dis-
 “ covered to themselves by the mere light of nature.
 “ These positions seem to follow from enquiries
 “ into the antiquities of the Heathen world and of
 “ their Religions. The Heathen Religions will all
 “ appear to be of a derivative nature; each cir-
 “ cumstance in the enquiry confirms the scriptural
 “ accounts of things, and sends us to the revela-
 “ tions, expressly mentioned or indirectly implied,
 “ in the Old Testament, for the real original of
 “ the

“ the Pagan Religions in their simple state. This
 “ opinion receives great light and weight from Sir
 “ ISAAC NEWTON'S CHRONOLOGY.

“ It appears also very probable to me, that a
 “ careful examination of the powers of the human
 “ understanding would confirm the same position;
 “ and that, admitting the novelty of the present
 “ world, there is no way of accounting for the
 “ rise and progress of religious Knowledge, as it
 “ has taken place, in fact, without having recourse
 “ to divine Revelation*.” But to return

4. To the question, Whether the first Man had
 any *original Righteousness* before he sinned? Socr-
 nus replies: “ Most men say that he had. But I
 “ wish to know what they mean by the terms *ori-*
 “ *ginal Righteousness*. For if they mean his condi-

“ tion was such that he could not sin, which we
 “ believe to be the case of good Angels, this cer-
 “ tainly was not the state of ADAM, as it is clear
 “ he did sin. Nor could he have sinned, unless it
 “ had been in his power to have sinned. If they
 “ understand by it, he did not sin before he did
 “ sin, the assertion is ridiculous, and the dispute
 “ evidently needless. For who knows not that
 “ no one sins before he does sin? But if they
 “ should

* HARTLEY on Man, vol. ii. p. 139, 140, 175.

“ should say the word sin, in the question, signi-
 “ fies not every sin, but the fault of eating the
 “ fruit of the forbidden tree ; and that ADAM, be-
 “ fore this transgression, was righteous, because he
 “ had not before committed any other sin. This
 “ was not original, but actual righteousness.

“ Besides, before this fault, ADAM had not
 “ sinned, either because he had not transgressed
 “ any other positive commandment of God, or
 “ because he had done nothing against his own
 “ conscience. If the first reason be adopted,
 “ I again make a distinction ; for he had, or had
 “ not received other commandments from God :
 “ If he had received none, he could not transgress
 “ any : how can he then be esteemed righteous,
 “ because he did not what, although he earnestly
 “ wished or would have done, he had it not in
 “ his power to do ? If he did receive any other
 “ commandment, let them say what it was, and
 “ shew that it was observed by him.

“ If the other assertion be adopted, let them
 “ prove that ADAM, before this crime, committed
 “ nothing contrary to his own conscience, which
 “ they certainly can never prove. We may there-
 “ fore conclude, that ADAM, before he transgressed
 “ this command of God, was not really righteous,

“ as

“ as he was not impeccable, nor had been tried with
 “ any opportunity of sinning. Or at least it can-
 “ not be affirmed that he was righteous, when it
 “ by no means appears in what instance he ab-
 “ stained from sin.

“ But some will say *original Righteousness* con-
 “ sisted in this, that his reason had the rule over
 “ his appetites and senses and directed them, and
 “ that there was no variance between it and them.
 “ But their assertion is supported by no argument ;
 “ since it should seem from ADAM's fall, that there
 “ was no perfect harmony between them, and that
 “ his appetites and senses had the dominion over
 “ his reason *.”

5. Nearly connected with the former question in
 Theological Debates is this, Whether there be any
 such thing as *original Sin*, and what it is? On this
 topic SOCINUS says, “ There is a two-fold account
 “ of sin, or the meaning of the word SIN, in the
 “ sacred Writings is two-fold, for it signifies guilt
 “ or punishment. We here speak of its princi-
 “ pal meanings, and what have a connection with
 “ this question. When therefore it is asked, Whe-
 “ ther there is original sin? It is the same as if it
 “ were enquired, Whether men when they are
 “ born,

* Opera, tom. i. p. 539. col. 1, 2.

“ born, because they derive their origin from
 “ ADAM, on account of his fall, have contracted
 “ any guilt or punishment, or are obnoxious to
 “ any guilt or punishment? Therefore, since the
 “ proper consent of the will of the man who is
 “ guilty is absolutely necessary to constitute guilt;
 “ and there can be no punishment without antece-
 “ dent guilt, it seems not at all possible it should
 “ be said, that either guilt or punishment can have
 “ any place in a man when he is born; as he nei-
 “ ther has nor could before have any use of his
 “ own will. Hence it happens, that some have
 “ thought on two other unscriptural senses of the
 “ word sin. One is, that it signifies error without
 “ guilt; another that it betokens an evil arising
 “ from the guilt of another. And so they inter-
 “ pret original sin, or, as I may call it, the want of
 “ original righteousness, to be, that man naturally,
 “ unless he be assisted by the interposing grace of
 “ God, can do nothing but err, *i. e.* act contrarily
 “ to the Law of God; or they say that it consists
 “ in those evils which all men unavoidably suffer,
 “ on account of the guilt of the first parent. But
 “ as we proved above, that no such thing as ori-
 “ ginal righteousness was to be found in the first
 “ man, there is no room for the former of these
 “ senses; as for the latter, although what it asserts
 “ may be true, as we shall afterwards see, yet this
 “ idea

“ idea cannot be here admitted, because this fig-
 “ nification of the word sin seems too unusual,
 “ and perhaps not ever to be met with.

“ Some therefore mean by original sin, certain
 “ innate desires or evil concupiscence in man, and
 “ a proneness to sin; and this is a notion generally
 “ embraced. But this opinion cannot, on three
 “ accounts, be true. First, because it is not clear
 “ that this concupiscence, or proneness to sin, is in
 “ all men. And then, because although this should
 “ be evident, it does not follow that the cause of it
 “ is, that ADAM, from whom we all sprang, trans-
 “ gressed the divine command. Lastly, because
 “ this evil desire or proneness to sin, since it has
 “ not guilt joined with it, cannot be properly
 “ called his sin in whom it exists*. Moreover,
 “ these evil desires, which it is asserted are born
 “ with most men, do not flow from the sin of the
 “ first man, but from this, that man, by the fre-
 “ quent acts of sin, hath contracted the habit of
 “ sinning, and hath corrupted himself, which cor-
 “ ruption descends by propagation to his offspring.
 “ For this one sin by itself, could not have the
 “ power of corrupting even ADAM himself, much
 “ less all his posterity. And we no where read
 “ that this corruption was the effect of the counsel
 “ of

* Opera, tom. i. p. 540. col. 1, 2.

“ of God, as a punishment of that sin ; and indeed
 “ it is highly incredible, nay impious, to suppose
 “ that God, the Author of all righteousness, could
 “ in any way be the cause of this pravity ; which
 “ pravity, so far as it is derived to men, as it was
 “ said, by propagation, cannot be properly called
 “ sin *.

“ We therefore conclude, that even speaking
 “ less properly, there is no such thing as original
 “ sin ; i. e. any taint or pravity through the sin of
 “ the first man, necessarily ingendered, or by any
 “ means inflicted upon the human race ; and that
 “ no other evil necessarily flows to all his posterity
 “ from that first transgression, than by some means
 “ or other the necessity of dying : not indeed
 “ through the influence of this transgression, but
 “ because man, being naturally mortal, was on that
 “ account left by God to his own natural mortality ;
 “ and what was natural became necessary as a pu-
 “ nishment on the offender. Therefore they who
 “ are born of him, must be born under the same
 “ circumstances, for he was deprived of nothing
 “ he naturally had or could have †.

Q

6. From

* Opera, tom. i. p. 541. col. 1.

† Ut supra.

6. From these premises SocINUS deduces his sentiments on *Free-will*, and man's ability to do the will of God. " From the debate, says he, it
 " clearly appears, there is a freedom of will in
 " man, if that be true which all grant, and reason
 " evidently teaches, that the first man was free before his fall. For there is no reason to be assigned, why he should be deprived of it after the
 " fall. Since neither the nature of the thing requires it, nor the justice of God permits it. Nor
 " is there any mention of this punishment amongst
 " the evils God affixed to the fall by way of punishment, as is plain to him that reads the third
 " chapter of GENESIS.

" But it is asked, How far doth the freedom of
 " man's will extend, and what strength does he
 " possess? As then we allow that in most men, not
 " indeed on account of the sin of the first parent,
 " but because men have gradually degenerated and
 " corrupted themselves, there is a great innate
 " propensity to sin, and a certain pravity; we
 " therefore say, that in most men there is naturally
 " but little strength to perform those things which
 " the Law of God requires; but by nature there
 " may be, and so in most men there really is, a
 " will to perform them, unless any one be brought
 " by

“ by the habit of sinning, to delight in sin and in-
 “ quity *.

“ Moreover the powers of man are not so small,
 “ but that he may, with the assistance of God,
 “ obey the divine law, if he apply his powers to
 “ this use. But God denies his help to no one
 “ to whom he hath given a law, otherwise he could
 “ not with any reason reprove and punish those
 “ who do not keep it, and yet he doth both.
 “ Therefore God hath not given a law no one can
 “ keep, since *the Law*, as the Apostle saith, *is or-*
 “ *dained unto life*, Rom. vii. 10. And as the same
 “ Author says, from MOSES, *He shall live by the law,*
 “ *who doth the things the law requires*, Rom. x. 5.
 “ Yet God gave the law to the observance of
 “ which there would be need of his help, that
 “ there might be constant occasion for us to de-
 “ pend upon him, and more plainly to perceive
 “ that he is the Author of our life and happiness.

“ Now this divine assistance is twofold, exter-
 “ nal and internal. The external aids are, the
 “ promises of some good annexed to the law, ani-
 “ mated by the desire and hope of which, men are
 “ made superior to the difficulties of observing it;
 “ or the denunciation of some evil, alarmed by

Q 2

“ the

* Opera, tom. i. p. 541. col. 2.

“ the hatred and fear of which, men become very
 “ cautious not to oppose it ; and also the external
 “ confirmation of these promises and threatnings,
 “ the former more powerfully excite us to practise
 “ than the latter. Therefore, as under the New
 “ Testament the promises are much more excel-
 “ lent than under the Old, hence it becomes much
 “ more easy to obey the divine law under the New,
 “ than it was under the Old Testament *.

“ The internal assistance is moreover twofold.
 “ The one is, when God by some means impres-
 “ seth on the heart, what he hath promised to them
 “ that obey him. The other is, when he instructs
 “ and illuminates the mind rightly to discern his
 “ will, all the instances of which cannot be ex-
 “ pressly contained in his written Word, on ac-
 “ count of the infinite variety of things there is
 “ occasion in human life to deliberate about and
 “ perform. To this latter head belong all those
 “ places, in which God is requested to teach his
 “ will, as *Psal.* cxliii. 8. cxix. many parts, parti-
 “ cularly under the division AIN. Of the former
 “ are to be understood the places in which mention
 “ is made of the Holy Spirit, which God gave to
 “ man as a kind of earnest of some future good,
 “ 2 *Cor.* i. 22. v. 5. *Eph.* i. 13, 14. For that the
 “ external

* Opera, tom. i. p. 541. col. 2.

“ external gifts of the Spirit are not meant in
 “ these places, but an internal influence, the first
 “ of these passages seems to prove, where it is
 “ written, *and hath given the earnest of the Spirit in*
 “ *our hearts**.

“ Of these two internal assistances, the first is
 “ more proper to the New Testament, the latter
 “ to the Old. For as in the New, the most ex-
 “ cellent good is promised; so under the Old, the
 “ will of God, relative to our actions in this state,
 “ is not so clearly explained as under the New.

“ From what hath been said it may be inferred,
 “ that is properly assistance which we call ex-
 “ ternal, since the internal of both kinds is no
 “ other than a suggestion and sealing of the exter-
 “ nal; especially when the internal falls to the por-
 “ tion of no one, who hath not before made a good
 “ use of the external†.

7. After treating of this point, SocINUS largely
 discusses the doctrine of PREDESTINATION, and
 the principle of divine PRESCIENCE on which it is
 founded. I can only make a few extracts from his
 chapters on this subject.

Q 3

“ To

* Opera, tom. i. p. 542. col. 2.

† Ut supra.

“ To this not less true than most evident doc-
 “ trine of the sacred Books (*i. e.* the FREE-WILL
 “ of Man) is opposed the PREDESTINATION of
 “ GOD, by which he hath from all eternity de-
 “ creed what individual men should be saved, and
 “ who should be damned. For if this be true; as
 “ it is clear good men will be saved and the wicked
 “ condemned, GOD must likewise have decreed
 “ who shall be good and who shall be wicked, or
 “ at least this is certain from all eternity. The
 “ consequence of this is, that there is no liberty
 “ left to men in the things that relate to their own
 “ virtue and wickedness.

“ We therefore deny this PREDESTINATION,
 “ and, besides the innumerable sacred testimo-
 “ nies which plainly deny it, chiefly on two ac-
 “ counts. The one is, that if this notion be true,
 “ the very foundation of Religion is subverted;
 “ the other is, that if this doctrine is granted, we
 “ must attribute to GOD many things most unwor-
 “ thy of him*.

“ One reason by which it is attempted to be
 “ proved that man hath no power, but that all
 “ things depend on the decree of GOD, or are
 “ certainly necessary, is drawn from the *Foreknow-*
 “ ledge

* Opera, tom. i. p. 542. col. 1, 2.

“*ledge or Prescience of God* *.” The principle on which this reason is founded, SocINUS thought wanted proof, and he considers the arguments by which it is commonly supported.

In particular, after having examined the proof from the Prophecies alledged in this question, he concludes by saying, “ There are many other sacred
 “ testimonies, which seem to establish the notion of
 “ the *divine Foreknowledge*, to all which he will be able
 “ easily to return an answer who will weigh and con-
 “ sider what we have above observed. From which
 “ these four rules may be inferred and laid down :
 “ First, If any passage speak of good works certainly
 “ foreseen, God himself hath undoubtedly decreed
 “ them. Secondly, Whether it speaks of good or
 “ evil actions, the prediction may be founded only
 “ on probabilities and on this account not certain,
 “ nor arising from that foreknowledge of which we
 “ are enquiring. Thirdly, That it may be rather
 “ an admonition to do good, or to avoid what is
 “ evil. Fourthly, That if it be a certain predic-
 “ tion of an evil work, this work was indeed de-
 “ creed by God, but not the malignity of heart.
 “ We say nothing of things indifferent, which
 “ every one may see are therefore predicted, be-

Q 4

“ cause

* Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 544. col. 1, 2.

“ cause they were decreed : yet if any one chuses
 “ to make this a fifth rule let him do it †.”

8. SOCINUS's ideas on the Doctrine of JUSTIFICATION are expressed in the following THESES.

“ God is willing to save and grant eternal life
 “ to all to whom the Gospel is preached, if they
 “ believe in and obey the Gospel ; and the power
 “ of believing and obeying he in general granteth
 “ to all.

“ When God delivered his own Son to Death
 “ for our sakes, it was not his intention, by this
 “ means, in any respect to satisfy the justice which
 “ is exercised in the punishment of sinners ; but
 “ to bring us to himself, and redeem us from the
 “ punishment of our sins, and also from our sins
 “ themselves.

“ And although it be a point manifestly and
 “ undoubtedly true, that JESUS CHRIST, the Son
 “ of God, poured out his blood for the remission
 “ of our sins ; yet the death of CHRIST by itself
 “ alone, without his ensuing resurrection and sit-
 “ ting down at the right hand of God, could nei-
 “ ther

† Opera, tom. i. p. 549, col. 1, 2.

“ ther make us partakers of this remission, nor
 “ clearly confirm it to us.

“ GOD out of his mere grace and mercy justi-
 “ fies us, *i. e.* pronounces us righteous, and grants
 “ us forgiveness of sins and eternal life. But he
 “ requireth from us, before this be done, that we
 “ believe in CHRIST, *i. e.* that we confide in him
 “ and obey him.

“ Therefore no one is justified before GOD, un-
 “ less he first confide in CHRIST and obey him;
 “ which obedience constitutes those good works
 “ by which the Apostle JAMES declares we are
 “ justified: so that when the Apostle PAUL denies
 “ we are justified by works, by the word WORKS
 “ he means the perfect observance of the divine
 “ Law through the whole life; and his intention is
 “ only to say, we cannot be justified before GOD
 “ by the merit of these works, but not that no
 “ good works are required of us to our justifica-
 “ tion before GOD. For our good works, or the
 “ obedience we render to CHRIST, although not
 “ the efficient nor meritorious cause, yet are, as it
 “ is called, the *SINE QUA NON*, *the indispensable pre-*
 “ *requisite* of our justification before GOD, and our
 “ eternal salvation.

“ Now

“ Now this obedience is nothing else than to
 “ keep the precepts of CHRIST. But the precepts
 “ of CHRIST, to speak very briefly, are, besides
 “ all the moral commandments contained in the
 “ Law of MOSES, to abstain from all worldly lusts,
 “ so as to be contented with what is necessary for
 “ our passage through life, nor to seek or claim
 “ any thing more.

“ We are to exert all our endeavours not to
 “ transgress, in the least degree, these precepts.
 “ But if we be not so happy as to attain hereto,
 “ but only reach so far, as to walk not according
 “ to the flesh but according to the Spirit, yet we
 “ may with propriety be said to obey CHRIST;
 “ nor will those faults be imputed to us, which we
 “ sometimes commit, contrary to the precepts of
 “ CHRIST, through human ignorance and frailty;
 “ our justification remaining always entire, whilst
 “ we do not live in the practice of any sin con-
 “ trary to the precepts of CHRIST.

“ But if it should happen that we deviate from
 “ this obedience, and fall into one or more sins,
 “ and continue in them, we cease to be justified.

“ Yet we may, by repentance and amendment of
 “ life, according to the commands of CHRIST, be
 “ justified

“ justified again ; but this second repentance is
 “ not in our power, but God granteth an ability
 “ for it, to whom he pleaseth and sees fit *.”

After this survey of the Opinions of SOCINUS on those DOCTRINAL subjects, that have been controverted in the Christian world ; it remains to lay before the Reader his sentiments on some other Topics, that are rather of the practical kind.

V. THE SENTIMENTS OF SOCINUS ON MAGISTRACY, WAR, PUNISHMENTS, RESISTANCE, SELF-DEFENCE, USURY, THE SACRAMENTS, AND THE CHURCH.

His general ideas on most of the above topics, are expressed in one of his letters, which I shall give entire.

“ To ELIAS ARCISSEVIUS, a Gentleman highly
 “ adorned with piety and virtue, and a diligent
 “ labourer in the vineyard of CHRIST, my
 “ greatly esteemed Friend and Brother in
 “ CHRIST, SOCINUS wisheth salvation from God
 “ and CHRIST.

“ It

* SOCIN. Opera, tom. i. p. 603. col. 2. p. 604. col. 1, THESES DE JUSTIFICATIONE.

“ It gives me concern that you left *Lippa* be-
 “ fore the receipt of my answer to your letters,
 “ for there were some things in it which I wished
 “ you to read to the Brethren, some of whom ima-
 “ gine I am now wholly engaged in heaping up
 “ money. I rejoice that your Assembly, though it
 “ continued but a few days, was not uselefs. To
 “ the queries you propose to me, take this brief
 “ reply.

“ I think it lawful for a Christian to bear the
 “ office even of a chief Magistrate, if, in the exe-
 “ cution of his office, he do not any thing contrary
 “ to Christian charity. I can scarcely think that
 “ Christian charity by any means allows the putting
 “ of the guilty to death, or mutilating their limbs.
 “ Nor will any Christian Magistrate, if he regard
 “ my advice, venture to do this.

“ The question relative to war, whether it can
 “ be vindicated or not, is much more difficult.
 “ Whether for instance, a Christian who fills the
 “ post of the supreme Magistrate can, without the
 “ violation of Christian charity, use the assistance
 “ of those who are disposed to hire themselves to
 “ him : notwithstanding I am of opinion, that it is
 “ not allowable for a private Christian, even in
 “ order

“ order to keep off a war, to kill any one, or to
 “ mutilate him in any limb, though the supreme
 “ Magistrate command him to do it: otherwise it
 “ appears to me lawful for a Christian to be armed
 “ and to march with others, to suppress, without
 “ the murder of any one, the attack of assailing
 “ enemies; when he has first tried every measure
 “ that he may not be compelled to march forth,
 “ but may be allowed to purchase with money a
 “ leave of absence from personal services of this
 “ kind: which if he cannot obtain, it is better, in
 “ my judgment, to run some danger of giving
 “ offence to the weak in the faith, than to draw
 “ most certain ruin on himself and his connections.
 “ I will not alledge, that offence is not less given,
 “ nay much more offered, to a greater number,
 “ when any one refuses to obey the supreme Ma-
 “ gistrate; who all agree, in things not plainly re-
 “ pugnant to the precepts of CHRIST, is to be en-
 “ tirely obeyed.

“ As to dress and clothes, I should not suppose
 “ that the affair ought to be very exactly ascer-
 “ tained in the Church of CHRIST, by particular
 “ prohibitions of this or that mode. Only in ge-
 “ neral all luxury should be avoided. But I think
 “ the rule by which to ascertain what is luxury,
 “ is to be derived from the perpetual use and cus-

“ tom

“ tom of the place and country where we live.
 “ For there are some places, for instance, where
 “ the use of silk garments is not more luxurious
 “ than that of linen and woollen in *Poland*, which
 “ the lowest people in those places wear; and,
 “ as I am informed, is now the custom in some
 “ parts of *Italy*. Therefore they who suppose it
 “ unlawful for Christian women to wear a bonnet
 “ made of fashionable materials *, do, in my opi-
 “ nion, greatly mistake, when there is scarcely any
 “ woman so poor, who has not such a bonnet in
 “ this country.

“ With respect to the carrying of arms, my opi-
 “ nion is, that it is not forbidden to a Christian;
 “ yet through the danger of doing some mischief,
 “ and to avoid giving offence to the weak, I think
 “ a Christian ought to abstain from it; unless on
 “ a journey, as a defence against wild beasts and
 “ to

* In the original it is, *Non licere fœminæ Christianæ pileo ex Axamit confecto uti*. What is meant by AXAMIT I cannot learn by any Dictionaries I have an opportunity of consulting. I am inclined to think, with a sensible Friend, that as different parts of dress often take an arbitrary name from some place, person, or circumstance, as DRESDENS, CAPUCHINS, POMPADOURS, KEVENHALLERS, STEENKIRKS, HUSSARS, and many others, according to the reigning fashion; probably the AXAMIT was something of this kind.

“ to intimidate robbers. But whether any one
 “ may, to defend himself against the usual assaults
 “ of another person, wound and kill him, is
 “ a very difficult question. This is very certain,
 “ that a man placed in such dangerous situation
 “ ought to deem it sufficient if he can secure him-
 “ self or his life by flight or warding off blows,
 “ he ought not to suffer himself to be so transported
 “ with anger against his adversary, as to kill or
 “ even to wound him. Neither do I doubt but God
 “ usually suggests to a pious man, whom this danger
 “ may befall, some immediate wisdom, and so as-
 “ sists him, that he may not be forced, for the
 “ sake of preserving his own life, to kill his ad-
 “ versary, which is by all means to be avoided.
 “ But there does not seem to be the same or equal
 “ reason, with respect to bruises or wounds that
 “ are not mortal; and it may be supposed better
 “ slightly to beat or wound a neighbour who seeks
 “ unjustly to take away our life, than to surren-
 “ der one’s self to be killed by him, especially if
 “ we be not attacked on the account of our reli-
 “ gious profession itself, but for some other rea-
 “ sons.

“ A short letter cannot include all I might say
 “ on the points about which you ask my judgment.
 “ If God please, I will some time or other more
 “ accurately

“ accurately debate these matters in your com-
 “ pany. I have no article of intelligence to com-
 “ municate to you, except that the Jesuit SMIG-
 “ LECIUS, who disputed with LICINIUS, hath pub-
 “ lished a Book on the eternal Divinity of the
 “ Son of God, in which he replies to a great
 “ part of what I have written against WUJEKUS
 “ and VOLANUS; which, with God’s assistance, I
 “ think to answer. For he is a very acute Writer,
 “ and abounds with Sophisms not obvious to every
 “ one. *Cracow, Feb. 15, 1595.* I am, with en-
 “ tire affection, Your, F. S.*”

SocINUS reckoned USURY lawful, and reasons
 on the subject in the following manner. “ Before I
 “ was worth any money, or thought I should ever
 “ be able to support myself by any other means
 “ than by the income arising from my estate, I
 “ was always of this opinion, that Usury was not
 “ by any means unlawful in itself, whatever the
 “ moral Philosophers or Divines might agree to
 “ the contrary. I shall now pass by the reason-
 “ ings of Moralists and Divines, because I have
 “ not time, and would not exceed the limits of a
 “ letter, and will speak only a word or two with
 “ regard to the authorities of the sacred Scrip-
 “ tures. I therefore take it for granted, that no
 “ pro-

* Opera, tom. i. p. 438. col. 1, 2.

“ prohibition of Usury can be found in all the
 “ NEW TESTAMENT: nay, I affirm that it is no
 “ weak argument of its lawfulness, that there ne-
 “ ver occurs any mention of it amongst those in-
 “ stances of human manners and behaviour, which
 “ are so frequently reckoned up, as inconsistent
 “ with the spirit and doctrine of the Gospel.

“ Having laid down this principle, as to the au-
 “ thorities of the OLD TESTAMENT, I observe
 “ first, that whatever prohibitions of usury we meet
 “ with out of the Law of MOSES, they must be
 “ explained according to the words of the Law;
 “ for the Prophets did not add to the Law, but
 “ only more copiously explained it. Therefore I
 “ assert, that the more brief injunctions of the
 “ Law on this point, and which seldom occur, are
 “ to be explained by the majority of express pre-
 “ scripts; especially when that only, which is more
 “ diffusely spoken, is agreeable to right reason.
 “ Now the three places in the Law that prohibit
 “ usury are *Exod.* xxii. 25. *Lev.* xxv. 35, 36, 37.
 “ *Deut.* xxiii. 19. The two first places, evidently
 “ the majority of the three, explicitly forbid usury,
 “ when it is received of a poor brother. There-
 “ fore although, in the remaining third place, it
 “ should be simply declared, that usury should not

R

“ be

“ be taken from any of the people, this must be
 “ explained by the two preceding passages, for what
 “ is said in them is evidently consonant to reason.
 “ But the other understood literally is so repugnant
 “ to reason, that it cannot be approved of on any
 “ principles of reason and religion, nor was ever
 “ practised in any nation. Nay, some degree of
 “ usury has been every where permitted, through
 “ all ages, and hath even, for the benefit of the
 “ poor, been publicly authoris'd and practised.

“ To this let it be added, that as the third place
 “ occurs in the Book which is a repetition of the
 “ Law, whatever is omitted, which was *specified* in
 “ the first promulgation of the Law, is to be sup-
 “ plied as is usual in repetitions.

“ I do not say that the word which here de-
 “ notes usury, seems to refer to that kind of usury
 “ which is exacted to the detriment of another.

“ Whatever passages then, either in the books
 “ of DAVID or EZEKIEL, or any other Writer,
 “ express an abhorrence of usury, are to be un-
 “ derstood according to this sense and of this kind
 “ of usury ; and in this sense, the New Testament
 “ also forbids usury, when we are expressly for-
 “ bidden

“ bidden to be avaricious and extortioners, and
 “ are commanded to do to others as we would
 “ have others do to us.

“ Lastly, if every kind of usury was in itself de-
 “ testable, God would never have expressly per-
 “ mitted the people of ISRAEL to have taken usury
 “ of foreigners, as he permitted it in this very pas-
 “ sage in DEUTERONOMY, where he only prohi-
 “ bits taking usury of a brother. I therefore con-
 “ clude that no usury in itself is forbidden by any
 “ precept, unless that which is injurious to the
 “ neighbour himself of whom it is required; nor
 “ is any thing else to be guarded against, unless of-
 “ fence and scandal to others, which is then to be
 “ avoided when otherwise no greater evil would be
 “ necessarily incurred *.”

Another point on which the Reader will perhaps
 be pleased to see the sentiments of SOCINUS, is
 the lawfulness of *the use of blood*.

To a Friend who had consulted him on this
 point, he replied: “ I will answer the question you
 “ have proposed to me, as concisely as the diffi-
 “ culty of it will admit, and I will try (though I
 “ can scarcely indulge the hope of it) whether in

R 2

“ a few

* SOCIN. Opera, tom. i. p. 457. col. 1, 2.

“ a few words I shall be able to effect that with
 “ you, which none have yet been able to do by a
 “ long disputation. I have touched upon the
 “ principles that must be applied to solve your ques-
 “ tion, in my disputation concerning *Water Bap-*
 “ *tism*: they are these. The precept forbidding to
 “ eat blood is repugnant to Christian liberty, and
 “ to the spirit of the Christian Religion, which is
 “ averse from ceremonial injunctions of this kind ;
 “ and from the express rule laid down by the
 “ Apostle PAUL, and often repeated by him, which
 “ is that no kind of meats are to be avoided by a
 “ Christian.

“ It is no objection to this reasoning, that the
 “ precept forbidding the eating of blood was given
 “ by GOD before the separation of his people, since
 “ the publication of a perfect Law was reserved
 “ for CHRIST and his Apostles. Before this period
 “ it pleased GOD that there should be always, from
 “ the beginning of the world, some imperfection in
 “ the rule of divine Worship, and of the obedience
 “ to be rendered to him ; the removal of which,
 “ by the coming of CHRIST, would produce a
 “ conviction, that the doctrine taught by him was
 “ wholly heavenly, and never would, whilst the
 “ earth endured, undergo any change or amend-
 “ ment. A proof of this imperfection existing from
 “ the

“ the beginning of the world, arises from the com-
 “ mand given to the first man, and from what is
 “ alledged by you out of the ninth of GENESIS,
 “ viz. that it was not lawful before the Flood to
 “ eat the flesh of animals. Which imperfection
 “ GOD removed at the renovation of the world;
 “ but not entirely, as still the blood of these ani-
 “ mals allowed for food was prohibited. For the
 “ honour of giving the finishing, or perfection to
 “ the law of GOD, was reserved to CHRIST and
 “ his times.

“ As to the two reasons, for which GOD, before
 “ the advent of CHRIST, forbade the eating of
 “ blood; one only and not both, as you appre-
 “ hend, remains in force, viz. that the life of the
 “ animal is in the blood. And what weight this
 “ ought to have with men professing the most per-
 “ fect scheme of principles, any one may judge
 “ for himself; inasmuch as the life does not lie in
 “ the blood of an animal when dead, more than in
 “ any other part: not to say no reason can be af-
 “ signed, why it should not be lawful to eat that in
 “ which is the life of the animal.

“ Let it be added, that although this reason
 “ should hold still, as to the blood of a dead ani-
 “ mal, and appear a just cause to abstain from eat-

“ ing it ; yet, as this command contains (as I ob-
 “ served) what is inconsistent with the nature of
 “ Christianity, such reasons are not to be regarded
 “ by us ; especially when the Apostle hath so ex-
 “ pressly laid down the rule quoted above on the
 “ use of meats. For I would ask, What more suit-
 “ able reason can be offered for God’s prohibit-
 “ ing all work on the seventh day, than that of-
 “ fered by the Divine Being himself, viz. that in
 “ the creation of the world he worked for six
 “ days, but rested on the seventh. And yet it is
 “ clear, on the authority of the same Apostle,
 “ that Christians are freed from the observation of
 “ the seventh day or the Sabbath, although this
 “ reason for it will endure as long as the world
 “ shall stand.

“ The other reason alledged from *Levit. xvii.*
 “ 10, 11. for not eating blood, which you think
 “ still holds good, in my opinion has ceased ; since
 “ under the Christian dispensation, no expiation is
 “ made to God by blood, at least by the blood of
 “ beasts ; for with respect to blood of this kind are
 “ the words of MOSES to be understood : nor, if
 “ this reason did still remain, would it have more
 “ strength than the other, under the perfect disci-
 “ pline of Christianity.

“ But

“ But if any one be deterred from eating the
 “ blood of animals, by the ecclesiastical decree in
 “ *Acts* xv. let him consider, that the same decree
 “ contains the prohibition of eating things which
 “ were sacrificed to idols; the eating of which
 “ *PAUL* allows, if it can be done without giving
 “ scandal and offence to the weak. I fear lest,
 “ when I have promised to discuss this matter in a
 “ very few words, I shall appear to have enlarged
 “ on it too much. But if you should wish for me
 “ to write still more on the subject, I will oblige
 “ you, and endeavour to remove every scruple of
 “ yours and of others. *Cracow, 16 Nov. 1596**.”

To give a view of the sentiments of *SOCINUS* on the other points which the title of this Section mentions, I would lay before the Reader the following quotations.

“ The Church is either visible or invisible. The
 “ visible Church is an assembly of men, who hold
 “ and profess so much of the true Religion of
 “ *CHRIST*, as is necessary to salvation. The in-
 “ visible Church is an assembly of men that trust
 “ in *CHRIST*, *i. e.* who are endued with a genuine
 “ and justifying faith in *CHRIST*, and who are
 “ scattered over the world. Again, the visible
 R 4 “ Church

* *Opera*, tom. i. p. 456. col. 2. p. 457. col. 1.

“ Church may be considered as one body, because
 “ it comprehends all the particular Churches or
 “ assemblies of those who profess the Christian
 “ Doctrine of Salvation as its members. Any
 “ single society, and so any, as it were, single
 “ member of the body we have spoken of, be-
 “ longing to the universal Church, may be deemed
 “ and called a Church. Which distinction does
 “ not hold with respect to the invisible Church *.

“ To choose some person out of every congre-
 “ gation, who may explain the Word of God to
 “ the rest, and exhort them from it to holiness of
 “ life and genuine piety, is an apostolical practice;
 “ neither can any reason, in my opinion, be pro-
 “ duced, why it ought not to prevail in this age.
 “ But that his authority should be so great, that
 “ all his dictates should be received without doubt
 “ or examination, and that no other should be
 “ allowed to speak in the Church, was not the
 “ custom of the Apostolic Church; and we see
 “ it not practised this day in many Churches,
 “ especially in those to whom, as far as it was al-
 “ lowed, I joined myself. Nay, in these the Mi-
 “ nisters of the Word of God are obnoxious to
 “ the reproofs and admonitions of all, and are
 “ often reprov'd and admonish'd by others; and
 “ it

“ it is lawful for every member of a Church to
 “ deliver his opinion on all points relative to di-
 “ vine Truth: moreover nothing is determined on
 “ any subject, before every one is by name asked
 “ to give his sentiments on it*.

“ But if in the times of the Apostles, when the
 “ Church openly exercised the gift of Prophecy,
 “ some one were chosen to preside in the expla-
 “ nation of the Christian Doctrine, as, besides the
 “ authority of all History and that of many parts
 “ of the Apostolic Epistles, is most plain from the
 “ Epistles of PAUL to TIMOTHY and TITUS; I
 “ do not see why this may not, or rather ought
 “ not to be done in the present age, when this
 “ gift is ceased.

“ The only thing to be guarded against is, that,
 “ as PETER admonishes, the Shepherds of the
 “ people do not *lord it over the flock*; which yet,
 “ in the time of PETER, he not obscurely inti-
 “ mates,

* In the religious Assemblies of the SOCINIANS every one had the liberty of speaking. One among them began with a Chapter of Scripture, and when he had read as many verses as formed a complete paragraph, the Reader and the Hearers, if they thought proper, delivered their sentiments on what had been read.

“ mates, depends more on the will and disposi-
 “ tion of the shepherds, than on any restraints laid
 “ on them by the people*.

“ With respect to the Sacraments, *i. e.* as the
 “ term is used by those who have separated from
 “ Antichrist, *Baptism and the Lord's Supper*: there
 “ is no circumstance in the latter to justify a sus-
 “ picion, that it may not be celebrated by any as-
 “ sembly professing the name of CHRIST. For
 “ neither were these most easy and simple rites
 “ prescribed by CHRIST to the Apostles as Apo-
 “ STLES, but merely as DISCIPLES or Christians;
 “ which the words of the Apostle PAUL, *1 Cor.*
 “ *xi.* plainly shew: and his fuller representation
 “ of the words of CHRIST, in which is contained
 “ the end of this rite, as a commemoration and
 “ annunciation of the death of CHRIST, till the
 “ Lord shall come: the thing itself, and the most
 “ antient name of this rite, *viz.* EUCHARIST, are
 “ evident proofs that the act of thanksgiving for his
 “ death attended it. Now every one must be
 “ obliged to own, that to commemorate and an-
 “ nounce the death of CHRIST, and to render
 “ public thanks, belong equally to all Christians.
 “ Nor is there, in this rite, any grant or mini-
 “ stration of some divine blessing, and therefore
 “ no

† Soc. Opera, tom. i. p. 347. col. 1, 2.

“ no particular person is necessary, who, as the
 “ Vicegerent of CHRIST, shall distribute the bread
 “ and wine to the rest; although this was done at
 “ first by CHRIST, the Institutor, when he was about
 “ to appoint it *.

“ As to the BAPTISM OF WATER, I apprehend
 “ it is not a perpetual ordinance in the Church, and
 “ was not prescribed for them, who in any other
 “ way have publicly given their names to CHRIST,
 “ or from their earliest years have been educated
 “ and instructed in the Christian Discipline.

“ Yet I should think, if it is to be retained
 “ in these days, it is to be retained principally on
 “ their account who have been converted from
 “ other Religions to the Christian: and I do not
 “ see why such may not be baptized by those who
 “ have preached CHRIST to them: or, if they
 “ have no spiritual Father in CHRIST amongst men,
 “ why he may not perform this service, who has
 “ been fixed upon for this office by the congrega-
 “ tion to which they are willing to join themselves:
 “ since the Baptism of Water, administred in the
 “ name of JESUS CHRIST, is only shadowing forth
 “ the forgiveness of sins in the name of CHRIST,
 “ in open profession of his name, and a kind of
 “ initiation

* Opera, tom. i, p. 350. col. 2.

“ initiation into his Religion: nothing is really
 “ communicated by it, but it is a recognizance of
 “ what hath been granted, and will most certainly
 “ be bestowed *.”

Amongst the other sentiments and practices of the CALVINISTS, or EVANGELICAL, which SOCI-
 NUS regarded as erroneous, he reckons their opi-
 nions concerning Baptism. One mistake, as he
 thought, which they espoused on this article, was
 an apprehension, that Baptism was a seal from hea-
 ven of the remission of sins, and a confirmation
 of the faith of the adult. On this he remarks,
 “ That the nature of a seal consists in its being a
 “ proof or evidence of a transaction; but this is
 “ not true of Baptism, though an holy rite: for,
 “ by the washing of the body, it is only a shadow
 “ and emblematical representation of the remis-
 “ sion of sins, the doctrine of which had been pre-
 “ viously explained by words.—As to its being a
 “ confirmation of the faith of the adult who re-
 “ ceive it, nothing more need be said, than that
 “ there is no trace of this in the sacred Writings;
 “ but a cordial faith was required, as a pre-requi-
 “ site for Baptism. Neither is this ceremony en-
 “ dowed with any such power or efficacy; but
 “ whatever confirmation faith might receive
 “ through

* Opera, tom. i. p. 350, 351.

“ through this rite, must be derived from the Holy
 “ Spirit, which was bestowed after Baptism; to
 “ afford a public evidence of the truth of Chris-
 “ tianity, and the effects of which were visible
 “ and conspicuous.”

He reckoned also the practice of *Infant Baptism* as a great and hurtful error; particularly because the stress laid upon it by the CALVINISTS as well as the PAPISTS, disposed them to hold in detestation those who did not approve of it or practise it, whom they could scarcely regard as CHRISTIANS. “ It
 “ is surprising (says SOCINUS) how much they de-
 “ part, in this instance, from Christian charity, and
 “ so deviate from the true way of Salvation. For
 “ what can be more plain, and evident from rea-
 “ son and Scripture, than that to the right admi-
 “ nistration of Baptism, it is previously necessary
 “ that the baptized person should be a believer.
 “ For Christian Baptism was administered in the
 “ Name of JESUS CHRIST, in whom the baptized
 “ person professed to believe, and was by this
 “ mode declared to be the disciple of CHRIST,
 “ *Acts* ii. 38, 41. viii. 16, 37. x. 48. xix. 5. As
 “ all the examples and circumstances of the Bap-
 “ tism administered by the Apostles after the Re-
 “ surrection evidently shew; nor doth one example
 “ of Infant Baptism occur in the Scriptures. For
 “ as

“ as to what some alledge as a proof of this, that
 “ the Baptisms of an household or family is several
 “ times mentioned, *Acts* xxv. 15, 33. *1 Cor.* i. 15.
 “ they do not reflect that this must be understood
 “ of those members of a family, who were capable
 “ of Baptism; as is expressly pointed out in the
 “ second of these passages. To this let it be added,
 “ that to justify such a conclusion, it must be clear
 “ from other evidences and circumstances, that
 “ there were infants in those families; but no-
 “ thing of this appears *.”

Whilst SocINUS thus discarded the general and
 prevailing sentiments held by the Reformer on the
 subject of Baptism, he likewise disapproved of the
 opinions of the UNITARIAN Churches, in *Poland*,
 on this head; as appears from a particular Tract
 on this point, and from a Letter to SIMON RO-
 NEMBERG, an Elder of the Church at *Racow*; in
 which he endeavours to prove that the UNITARIAN
 Churches were in a grievous error, and imposed a
 burden on the Brethren, as they would receive
 none under this character, nor admit them to their
 communion, who did not in mature life submit to
 immersion, as an avowal of their faith in Christ †.

SECTION

* Opera, tom. i. p. 702. col. 1, 2.

† Idem, p. 429—431.

SECTION III.

The Progress of SOCINIANISM. Reflections on the Opinions of SOCINUS; and the Sentiments of different Writers on his Scheme.

IN the preceding Sections I have endeavoured to throw together, and place in one view, the sentiments of SOCINUS on the different subjects of theological debate, which are scattered through his diffusive writings. Every disguise and misrepresentation has been cautiously guarded against, and SOCINUS has related his ideas to us in his own words, allowance only being made for the unavoidable difference that arises from transferring his expressions from one language to another. His opinions, as they gained ground, were afterwards cast into a more systematical form, and, in some instances, differently modelled. For his avowed disciples took him only for their guide, and did not, without exception, adopt the sentiments of their Chief; and no sect carried freedom of thought
and

and a disavowal of all authority in religious matters farther than they did *.

Yet the scheme of religious Principles that bears his name, was in general such as he had advanced, taught and vindicated.

Before his time many persons in *Europe*, and in *Poland* in particular, some whole societies of Christians had discarded the common doctrine of the TRINITY, and in other points differed from the PROTESTANTS of the age. But all these Churches did not agree in the same Articles of Belief. When SOCINUS came into POLAND they formed different societies, and they reckon thirty-two, which had scarcely any common principle but this, that JESUS CHRIST was not the true God †.

They

* Mais ils n'ont fait en cela que suivre le sentiment de SOCIN, qui leur a servi de guide. Je fais cette remarque, parce qu'ils n'ont pas adopté sans exception les sentiments de leur Chef, nulle secte ne poussant plus loin la liberté de penser, & l'indépendance de toute autorité.

ENCYCLOPEDIE. Art. UNITAIRES.

† DICTIONNAIRE des HERESIES. Art. SOCINIANISME, p. 57.

They had received the grant of a settlement in the city of *Racow*, and the first thing they attempted under the auspices of this promising situation, was a translation of the Bible into the *Polish* language, which was accordingly published in the year 1572. After they had finished this new version, they drew up a summary of their religious Doctrine, which was published in *Cracow*, in the year 1574, under the title of the CATECHISM, or Confession of the UNITARIANS.

“ The system of Religion (says the learned Dr. MOSHEIM) that is contained in this Catechism, is remarkable for its simplicity, and is neither loaded with scholastic terms nor subtle discussions; but it nevertheless breathes, in several places, the spirit of SOCINIANISM, and that even in those parts of it which its Authors look upon as most important and fundamental *.” This little piece it seems is not much known, and is very scarce; and it is supposed, that when the SOCINIANS, in process of time, had gained ground, and drawn up a new summary of their Doctrine, they bought up all the copies of this, with a view to bury it in oblivion.

S

From

* MOSHEIM's Eccles. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. 3. part ii. ch. 4. paragraph 10. or vol. iv. p. 181. 182. 8vo. edit. 1768. *London*. and DICT. des HERESIES, p. 57.

From the time SocINUS appeared as the Patron and Advocate of this Sect, their credit revived and it assumed a new face. “ He triumphed (says “ the above celebrated Author) over all the diffi- “ culties that had been laid in his way, by the “ power of his eloquence, the spirit and address “ that reigned in his compositions, the elegance “ and gentleness of his manners, the favour and “ protection of the Nobility, which he had ac- “ quired by his happy talents and accomplish- “ ments, and also by some lucky hits of fortune “ that favoured his enterprizes*.”

The UNITARIAN system received from SocINUS's labours and pen, a method, consistency and connection it before wanted. Many persons of rank and opulence became converts to it. It was for some years favoured with the protection of the great, and assisted by the liberality of the rich. These circumstances gave rise to the publication of a new form of Doctrine, which appeared under the name of the RACOVIAN CATECHISM, and is still regarded as the Confession of Faith of the whole Church. It is said to have been first drawn up by SocINUS, but though in his Works there be

* MosHEIM's Eccles. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. 3. part ii. ch. 4. paragraph 11.

be some fragments of catechetical compositions, they vary from this, as well as are imperfect. The labour of reforming their CATECHISM was entrusted to PETER STATORIUS as well as SOCINUS; but they did not finish the work, but died soon after. It was then resumed, and continued by VALENTINUS SMALCIUS and HIERONYMUS MOSCOROVIVS. Some corrected this piece, others augmented it, all the eminent SOCINIAN Doctors revised it, and some published notes on it.

This CATECHISM was first published in 1609, with a Dedication to our King JAMES I. This edition was entitled *Catechesis Ecclesiarum; quæ in regno Poloniæ, et magno ducatu Lithuanix, et aliis ad istum regnum pertinentibus provinciis, affirmant neminem alium præter Patrem Domini nostri JESU CHRISTI, esse unum illum DEUM Israelis; Hominem autem illum Nazarenum, qui ex Virgine natus est, nec alium præter aut ante ipsum DEI Filium unigenitum, et agnoscunt et confitentur. Racoviæ, anno 1609. i. e.* The Catechism of the Churches, who in the kingdom of *Poland* and in the great dukedom of *Lithuania*, and in other provinces belonging to that kingdom, affirm that no other being, besides the Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, is the one God of *Israel*; but acknowledge and confess that the Man of *Nazareth*, who was born of a virgin, and

no other besides or before him is the only begotten Son of God *. In the year 1653, it was committed to the flames in *England*, by the order of Parliament. Probably this was an *English* translation of it, the work of Mr. JOHN BIDLE, and printed at *Amsterdam*.

There was a corrected edition of it with notes in 1684, with this title, *Cathesis Ecclesiarum Polonicarum, unum DEUM Patrem, illiusque Filium unigenitum JESUM CHRISTUM, una cum Spiritu Sancto, ex sacra Scriptura consentientium. Primum, anno MDCIX, in lucem emissam; et post earundem Ecclesiarum jussu correctam ac dimidio amplius, parte auctam atque per viros in his cætibz inçlytos, JOHANNEM CRELLIUM, Francum; hinc JONAM SCHLICHTINGIUM, a Bukowiec; ut et MARTINUM RUARUM; ac tandem ANDREAM WISSOWATIUM, BENEDICTUM WISSOWATIUM, necnon Anonymum quendam F. C. recognita atque emendata. Notisqz horum, tum et aliorum illustrata. Editio novissima. Stauropoli, per EULOGETUM PHILALETHUM. CIOCLXXXIV. i. e. The Catechism of the Churches of Poland, who confess, according to the Holy Scriptures, one God the Father, and his only begotten Son JESUS CHRIST, with the Holy Spirit. First published in the year 1609; and since, by order of the*
fame

* SANDII Biblioth. Antitr. p. 78, 105, 106.

same Churches, corrected and enlarged more than half; and revised and improved by some illustrious men in those assemblies, JOHANNES CRELLIUS, of *Franconia*; JONAS SCHLICHTINGIUS, of *Bukowiec*; MARTINUS RUARUS, and ANDREAS WISSOWATIUS; BENEDICTUS WISSOWATIUS; and also an anonymous Person, F. C. Illustrated with theirs and others notes. The last edition at *Stauropolis*, by EULOGETUS PHILALETHES. 1684.

In the preface to this Catechism they argue for the liberty of private judgment, and disclaim the exercise of human authority in matters of Religion.

“ Many learned and pious men (they say) in the
 “ present day, justly complain that the Confessions
 “ and Catechisms published by different Christian
 “ Churches, are scarcely any thing more than the
 “ trumpets of strife, and standards of immortal
 “ hatreds and factions among men. The reason
 “ of this is, that these Confessions and Catechisms
 “ are so proposed, that conscience is bound by
 “ them, and a yoke is laid upon Christians, of
 “ swearing to the words and opinions of men, and
 “ they are established as the rule of faith: whoever
 “ deviates the least from these, the thunderbolt of
 “ an ANATHEMA is immediately thrown at him; he
 “ is treated as an HERETIC, as a most base and mis-
 “ chievous person, is banished from heaven, thrust
 S 3 “ down

“ down to hell, and doomed to be tormented
 “ with infernal fire.

“ Far be this temper, rather this madness from
 “ us. Whilst we compose a Catechism, we do not
 “ prescribe to any man: whilst we express our
 “ own opinions, we oppress none. Let every man
 “ enjoy the freedom of his own understanding in
 “ Religion; only let us be indulged with the li-
 “ berty of publishing our own apprehensions on
 “ divine things, without hurting or reviling any
 “ one.

“ For this is the invaluable liberty of prophesy-
 “ ing, which the sacred Books of the New Testa-
 “ ment so earnestly commend, and in which we
 “ are instructed by the example of the primitive
 “ Apostolic Church. *Quench not the Spirit*, says
 “ the Apostle, *1 Theff. v. 19, 20. Despise not pro-*
 “ *phesyings, prove all things, hold fast that which is*
 “ *good*: and how deaf to this most holy admoni-
 “ tion of the Apostle is the Christian world, di-
 “ vided into so many sects, at these times become!
 “ Base men who endeavour to stifle and extinguish
 “ the fire of the Holy Spirit, in the minds in which
 “ God hath judged fit to kindle it! Is not this
 “ obstinately to strive against God? *Do ye provoke*
 “ *the Lord? Are ye stronger than he? 1 Cor. x. 22.*

“ Who

“ Who are you that despise or envy in others the
 “ gift of prophecy, which excels almost all other
 “ gifts? Why do ye not rather imitate the great
 “ Mediator of the old Covenant, whom none sur-
 “ passed in meekness, and say with him, *Would to*
 “ *GOD that all the Lord's people were prophets?* Num.
 “ xi. 20.

“ Who are ye that allow the trial neither of
 “ your own or others sentiments, that what is good
 “ may be retained, and what is bad rejected; but
 “ require that your own opinions should be em-
 “ braced without examination or search, and be
 “ regarded by others with almost a servile submis-
 “ sion, and that the sentiments of others must be
 “ rejected and discarded without trial? *What?*
 “ *Came the Word of GOD out from you? Or came it*
 “ *to you only?* 1 Cor. xiv. 36. Do you alone bear
 “ the key of knowledge, that nothing in the sacred
 “ Scripture is enclosed and sealed up from you:
 “ that whatever you shut up no one can open, and
 “ whatever you open no one can shut up? Why
 “ do you not remember, that one only is our
 “ Master, to whom these prerogatives belong, even
 “ CHRIST; but that we are all brethren, no one
 “ of whom is invested with power and authority
 “ over the conscience of another? For although
 “ among brethren some may excel others in spiri-

“ tual gifts, yet as to the liberty and right of Son-
 “ ship all are equal.

“ But whilst, with the Apostle, we contend that
 “ the *Spirit should not be quenched*, nor *propheesyings*
 “ *despised*; let it not be thought that we are plead-
 “ ing the cause of enthusiasts, or arrogate to our-
 “ selves a prophetic or miraculous inspiration.
 “ We acknowledge that miraculous gifts no longer
 “ exist; such as the divine munificence poured out
 “ by CHRIST in a full, nay a threefold measure, at
 “ the rise of the Church, that the novelty of the
 “ Christian Religion might by them be supported:
 “ yet I think no one will deny, that the hand of the
 “ Lord is not shortened, and that the Holy Spirit
 “ is yet given to them that believe in CHRIST.
 “ For although rivers of living waters do not flow
 “ from the belly of them that believe, *i. e.* though
 “ the Holy Spirit be not given in the same abun-
 “ dance as before; though it do not display itself
 “ so conspicuously as before; though it have not
 “ such efficacy as to form and beget new powers
 “ in men as before: it is sufficient that at present
 “ such a divine influence may nevertheless be
 “ hoped for by those that invoke CHRIST with a
 “ pure heart, as will improve the powers natural
 “ to man, or acquired by study or art, and with
 “ the application of proper care and diligence,
 “ may

“ may dispose the mind, and quicken its apprehensions in investigating the sense of the sacred Scriptures. We grant that no Prophets are now commissioned, whose dictates are to be regarded as divine oracles, which it is unlawful to gainsay. Therefore we by no means assume such an authority; nay this is the conduct we blame in them who place their Confessions and Catechisms on almost an equal footing with the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, and reckon it unlawful to speak against them.”

And afterwards they conclude their Preface thus. “ The liberty therefore that we enforce, lies in the middle between licentiousness and usurpation, and that it may not degenerate into licentiousness, we would have it restrained within the bounds of equity and right reason. And first, we think in religious matters a distinction is to be observed, that the things necessary to salvation and those nearly connected with them, and which are highly useful, may be separated from the things not so necessary nor so useful. What are necessary it is unlawful to remove from their place or to impugn, nor can any one dissent from them without the loss of his salvation; and where there is not an agreement in these points, there can be no brotherly love. But these necessary

“ articles

“ articles are very few, and so clearly and plainly
 “ taught in the holy Scriptures, and written as it
 “ were with sun-beams, that even every one that
 “ has a sound mind in a sound body may easily
 “ distinguish them. We deny that the things
 “ which are not so clear are necessary points.
 “ And here we say with HILARY, that they are
 “ happy who, in things necessary to salvation,
 “ confine themselves within the limits of the most
 “ simple Creed, which is called the APOSTLES.
 “ But in other points that are not absolutely ne-
 “ cessary, we require to be indulged with this li-
 “ berty of prophesying.

“ But neither do we ask for this without limita-
 “ tions and restraint, for we wish to have it regu-
 “ lated by the dictates of Piety, Charity and Pru-
 “ dence. PIETY requires that nothing be said or
 “ done contrary to conscience; that nothing be
 “ uttered reproachful to God, or opposite to his
 “ glory and precepts. CHARITY instructs us that
 “ no one should be injured; that we ought to
 “ avoid all railing accusations of our neighbour,
 “ calumnies, and invidious and unfair representa-
 “ tions of another's opinion; but on the con-
 “ trary, that our equity, gentleness and modesty
 “ should be known to all. And lastly it belongs to
 “ PRUDENCE to regard times, places, persons,
 “ things,

“ things, and other circumstances; to consider that
 “ not every thing should be advanced in any man-
 “ ner, and any place or time; but all things should
 “ be done decently and in order, and to the edi-
 “ fication of the Church, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 26, 40. By
 “ which rules the Apostle himself restrained the
 “ liberty of prophesying.

“ We submit this Catechism, Reader, to your
 “ examination and judgment. If in any point
 “ you think we are carried out of the way of truth,
 “ admonish us in a friendly manner: be assured
 “ where you confute us by just and solid reasons,
 “ we will not obstinately withstand the truth, than
 “ which nothing is dearer to us. Would to God
 “ that all who love to be deemed Christians were
 “ of this temper! The truth would more easily
 “ prevail.”

This Catechism is divided into eleven SECTIONS,
 and most of the SECTIONS are subdivided into
 CHAPTERS. The *first* Section treats of the holy
 Scriptures, under the different heads of their Cer-
 tainty, Sufficiency and Perspicuity. The *second*
 briefly opens the way of Salvation, by enquiring in-
 to the reasons of the divine Will being revealed to
 men, and by touching on those things which lead to
 Salvation. The *third* treats of the Knowledge of
 God,

GOD, both of his nature and of his will. The truths relative to the Person of CHRIST, are the subject of the *fourth*. His Prophetical Office is explained in the *fifth*. The *sixth* opens, under different heads, various topics included in the Knowledge of CHRIST: such as the precepts CHRIST added to the MOSAIC Law, the Precepts he delivered distinctly from this connection, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the Promise of eternal Life, the Promise of the Holy Spirit, the Proofs of Revelation, the Death of CHRIST, Faith, Free-will, and Justification. The *seventh* section only touches upon the order in which the kingly and sacerdotal offices of CHRIST are to be considered: the latter of these are explained in the *eighth*, and in the *ninth* the former is discussed. The *tenth* only defines who are the people of CHRIST. The *eleventh* Section treats of the Church of CHRIST, of the Nature, Constitution and Discipline of the visible Church, and its State as invisible.

Thus the Reader is furnished by this catechetical Composition, with an extensive though concise view of the subjects of polemical, practical and speculative THEOLOGY. The most distinguishing advantage and a great excellence of it is, that not only the different topics are explained, and the peculiar sentiments of it defended by proper arguments

ments and texts of Scripture ; but the texts that are alledged by the opposers of the SOCINIAN scheme, and appear to be repugnant to it, are fairly quoted and particularly examined, and their meaning carefully investigated. There is a fairness and equity in this method of advancing and supporting their sentiments, which must recommend it to the candid enquirer after Truth ; and in consequence of it, an acquaintance with this Catechism is not merely an employment of memory, but an exercise of the understanding and judgment.

The learned MOSHEIM represents this Catechism as, in reality, “ no more than a collection of the “ popular tenets of the SOCINIANS, and by no “ means a just representation of the secret opinions and sentiments of their writers.” But he gives no instances and proofs of this. And whatever may be the case as to minute and nicer points, it treats of those subjects which were reckoned of the greatest importance in the explanation of the Christian scheme, and evidently advances and supports those of their opinions which were most obnoxious and offensive. Besides, they expressly offer it to the public, as containing their judgment and ideas on Religion*.

This

* Ex hac quam modo publici juris facimus, de nostro in Religione sensu judicari volumus. PRÆF.

This distinguished Writer * farther observes, “ it
 “ never obtained among the SOCINIANS the au-
 “ thority of a public Confession and Rule of
 “ Faith; and hence the Doctors of that sect were
 “ authorised to correct and contradict it, or to sub-
 “ stitute another form of Doctrine in its place.”

This remark, which seems made to detract from the credit of it, really reflects honour upon the Authors of the Catechism, and upon the SOCINIANS in general. It would have been inconsistent with the liberty of prophesying, for which we see they argue in the Preface to it, to have limited their religious enquiries to this standard; and to have treated it as a Rule of Faith, would have been a violation of their declarations, that they dictated to no one and assumed no authority.

And the alterations their sentiments underwent were the consequence of their avowed principles, and the result of the free enquiry they allowed. The Edition of the Catechism I have quoted was different from a preceding publication of that kind, being in some places altered, in others corrected, and in some instances enlarged. This they own, and their plea is not only a justification of those alterations, but a caveat against any censure of any future

* MOSHEIM's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 196.
 8vo. London. 1768.

future changes in their religious system; and furnish an answer to the eminent Historian. “ We think, say they, there is no reason to be ashamed of it, if our Church improve in some respects. We are not in every instance to cry out, “ I believe, I stand in my rank, here I fix my foot, and will not be removed the least from this place.” This is like the Stoics, obstinately to support every thing, and stiffly to persevere in our opinion. It is the duty of the Christian Philosopher, or of the Candidate for the Wisdom that comes from above, to be *ευπειθής*, not *αυθαδής*, easy to be persuaded, not pertinaciously pleasing himself; but ready to give up his opinion, where any other offers supported by stronger evidence *.”

The SOCINIANS did not confine their representations and proofs of their doctrine to the compass of a small catechetical piece; but they published a considerable number of books. Some of these were treatises on particular points, others were comments and expositions of whole books of Scripture; all were designed to illustrate and defend their THEOLOGICAL System. These books were printed at *Racow*, and were dispersed through different countries. To increase their influence and reputation

* PRÆFAT. ad CATECHISMI *Pol.* Eccles.

reputation, the paths of Science and Philosophy were opened to their youth, whom they instructed in the rules of ELOQUENCE and RHETORIC, and in the important branches of ORIENTAL, GREEK and LATIN Literature. They also sent Missionaries to several places, to propagate their Doctrines, towards the conclusion of the sixteenth Century, as appears evident (says MOSHEIM) from authentic records. But in this respect no great success crowned their zeal. PAPISTS, LUTHERANS, and the REFORMED, united their joint aids to oppose and extirpate this body of Christians. The ROMAN CATHOLICS in *Poland*, in particular, yielded merely to the necessities of the times in granting them liberty, and they embraced the first favourable occasion to excite the resentment of the Civil Magistrate, and to procure a public decree of the Diet against them.

In the year 1638 some students of the UNITARIAN ACADEMY in *Racow*, vented their zeal against Popish superstition in a rash and useless manner, by throwing stones at and breaking down a wooden crucifix that stood out of town. This action was pursued with a resentment fatal to the interest of SOCINIANISM. An accusation was laid against the whole body. In vain did the SOCINIANS offer the most solid proofs of their innocence. In vain did

did the PRESIDENT of the ACADEMY clear himself from the charge by a solemn oath. His distinguished character, his high rank, his age (being in the seventieth year) and his merits with his country had no weight. The protest of many Delegates of EQUESTRIAN rank, and of the GREEK and EVANGELIC and CATHOLIC Persuasion, as well as of the ARIAN Faith, against the extraordinary and arbitrary proceedings of the Diet had no weight. A law was enacted at *Warsaw*, by which it was resolved that the ACADEMY of *Racow* should be destroyed, its Professors banished with ignominy, the Printing-house of the SOCINIANS destroyed, and their Churches shut up. All this was executed without the smallest alleviation, or the least delay.

This was the forerunner of future calamities and oppressions. The like edicts were enacted in other parts of *Poland*. The COSSACKS, in their irruptions into the kingdom, practised their violences particularly on the UNITARIANS, who were odious to them on account of their religious opinions. Upon the King of *Sweden's* taking the opportunity of the disturbances in *Poland*, to invade it with his army like a torrent, they submitted to him for the benefit of his protection. This exposed them to great ravages from the Insurrection
T of

of the *Polish* Peasants, and excited their King CASIMIR, when he had recovered his losses, to take full revenge on them. For in the year 1658, a most severe and ruinous act was published by a Diet held at *Warsaw* *.

By this edict all the SOCINIANS were required to leave the kingdom for ever, and capital punishment was denounced against all those who should either profess their opinions, or harbour their persons. They were first indulged with three years to settle their affairs, and dispose of their effects before they went into exile; but this term was afterwards reduced

* It may be observed, that the Protestants in *Poland*, who had suffered the UNITARIANS to be banished about twenty years before, were afterwards reduced to such a poor and distressed situation, as to need the liberal services of other nations, and to solicit King CHARLES the Second for a Brief in their favour. They willingly permitted, nay promoted severe and intolerant measures against the UNITARIANS, when it was in their power to have prevented them, if so much as one of their Deputies had protested against them in the Diet; and now weakened by the loss of the whole UNITARIAN interest, it came to their own turns to be sufferers. They had never lost either country or liberty, if they had not voted themselves out of both, by their former votes against the UNITARIANS. A Toleration (says my Author) once tapped, will soon run all out; for break it in but one instance or party, and you have disannulled the whole reason of it, and all pleas for it †.

† Life of Mr. T. FIRMIN, p. 25, 26.

reduced to two years. In the year 1661 the terrible edict was renewed, and all the SOCINIANS that yet remained in *Poland* were barbarously driven out of that country, some with the loss of their goods, others with the loss of their lives, as neither sickness nor any domestic consideration could suspend the execution of that rigorous sentence *. In consequence of these severe measures the SOCINIANS sought an asylum among their Brethren in *Transylvania*. A considerable number were dispersed through the adjacent Provinces of *Silesia*, *Brandenburgh*, and *Prussia*, where their posterity still subsist. Others repaired to *Holland* and *England*. Thus their Churches, after having existed for more than an hundred years in *Poland*, were at last extirpated from it, and overwhelmed in the storm of persecution, when they had before increased and flourished amidst scenes of oppression and blood. Nor did they meet with much protection and favour in other countries; for whithersoever they retreated they found formidable enemies. Not only were they not established, but

T 2

the

* Vita WISSOWATII ad calcem SANDII BIBLIOTH. ANTITRI. p. 236, 241, 244, 254, 255. Equitis *Poloni* vindiciæ pro UNITARIORUM in *Polonia* Religionis Libertate, apud SANDIUM, in BIBLIOTH. ANTITRI. p. 267. MOSHEIM's Eccles. Hist. vol. v. p. 53, 54. BERRIMAN's Sermons, at Lady MOYER's Lectures, p. 415, 417.

the secular and ecclesiastical powers united against them, and they were every where condemned by the laws of the Church and the State. The remains of this unfortunate Community are at this day dispersed through different countries, particularly in the Kingdoms of *Prussia*, the Electorate of *Brandenburgh*, and the *United Provinces*; where they lie more or less concealed, and hold their religious assemblies in a clandestine manner*.

In *Transylvania* they still continue numerous, and are very much at their ease. In *Holland* their numbers are not considerable; and all who profess themselves such are by law excluded from the general Toleration which prevails in that kingdom. They assume the name of COLLEGIANTEN, and under this denomination they have places of public worship. They are all ANTIPÆDOBAPTISTS, and are the only persons of that denomination in *Holland* who practise IMMERSION, all the rest using Sprinkling.

A Friend in *Holland*, who has in a very obliging manner communicated to me this information, adds, concerning the present state of the SOCINIANS in *Poland*, that ever since

* MOSHEIM ut supra, p. 55. & DICTIONNAIRE DES HERESIES. Art. SOCINIANISME, p. 520.

since that suppression they have had Churches, which have assembled, like the primitive CHRISTIANS, or the *English* DISSENTERS when persecuted, or the PROTESTANTS in *France* at present, in private houses or woods, or fields, as opportunity permitted. These assemblies in general have been conducted under the inspection of a regular Ministry; many young men of that persuasion having followed their studies at *Leyden*, and at the SCHOLA ILLUSTRIS of the Remonstrants at *Amsterdam*, expressly for the work of the Ministry among that people. Since the edict 1661, they have been included by the *Romish* party in *Poland* under the general name of DISSIDENTS; which comprehends not only all the different kind of PROTESTANTS, but those also who belong to the *Greek* Church. Among these the SOCINIANS, equally obnoxious to all the different parties of PROTESTANTS on one hand, as to the *Romish* Church on the other, have been more or less under the cross from the year 1661. In that part of *Poland* which is not yet dismembered, they remain so still; but in those parts which by the late partition fell to the lot of *Prussia*, *Russia*, or the Emperor, they have now their liberty in common with their other DISSIDENT Brethren, and consequently have their public places of worship as well as the rest.

The only Society of SOCINIANS in *England* was that formed by the famous JOHN BIDDLE. He was a man of excellent piety and virtue, and great learning. He observed himself, and required of others, seriousness and reverence in speaking of GOD and CHRIST and holy things; so that he would by no means hear their names, or any sentence of holy Scripture used vainly or lightly, much less any foolish talking or scurrility. In his common conversation he expressed an awe of the divine Presence, and was sometimes observed to lift up his hand suddenly; which they who were intimate with him knew to be the effect of a secret ejaculation. In his closet devotion, it was his frequent custom to prostrate himself upon the ground, after the manner of our Saviour in his Agony, and he would recommend that posture of worship also to his most intimate friends. And he had such a lively sense of the obligations of humanity and kindness, that it was one of his lessons, that it is a duty not only to relieve, but to *visit* the sick and poor.

When the Parliament published a general act of oblivion, in the year 1651, this good man set up religious meetings on every Lord's day, with the friends he had gained in *London*, for expounding the Scriptures and discoursing thereupon, to investigate and ascertain the truths contained in them, and
to

to discover popular errors. Mr. THOMAS FIRMIN, that singular example of generosity and active benevolence, whose life was a continued series of useful measures and good actions, was his particular friend and patron*. Amongst the other members of this society, a young gentleman, whose name was NATHANIEL STUCKEY, was active in promoting its interests, and had great influence by his zeal and parts. He translated the Catechism of BIDDLE into Latin in the fifteenth year of his age, and subjoined an Oration on the sufferings and death of CHRIST.

The adherents to Mr. BIDDLE were called BIDELIANS; but this name was lost in the more common appellation of SOCINIANS, or, what they preferred, UNITARIANS. They did not perfectly agree in all points with SOCINUS and the foreign UNITARIANS.

T 4

RIANS.

* It affords a noble proof of the disinterested and generous spirit of this good man, that, in 1662, he procured, from private persons, and (though without a brief) from some collections in churches, charitable relief for the poor UNITARIANS in *Poland*: and, in 1681, he exerted his benevolent endeavours on behalf of the *Polonian* PROTESTANTS, who had assisted in banishing the *Polonian* UNITARIANS. He received, of nine dissenting congregations, £.110 16s. 10d. and he also collected the sum of £.568, 16s. 0d.³/₄ on the same account. Life of Mr. T. FIRMIN, p. 25, 26.

RIANS. They differed from them in this, that they believed the holy Spirit, though not GOD, is yet a Person, in the vulgar sense of that word. BIDDLE did not attempt to bring his friends to such a perfect conformity of sentiment to his opinions, and to unite them in such close mutual bonds, that would perpetuate the community, and continue them a successive party, bearing his name as their founder; but left them to all that liberty which was consistent with their mutual edification, and a conscientious profession of what appeared to their minds the truth*.

Accordingly, it does not appear that this society subsisted after his death: nor have the SOCINIANS ever made any figure, as a *community*, in *England*. But theological sentiments, nearly resembling the SOCINIAN system, have been held by various persons, (and probably are daily gaining ground,) and of late years have been more openly avowed and freely canvassed. Many societies of PROTESTANT DISSENTERS have become communities of professed UNITARIANS, though chiefly upon the ARIAN scheme; and the TRINITARIAN forms of worship,

* UNITARIAN Tracts, vol. i. Life of BIDDLE, p. 6, 10, 11. FIRMIN'S Life, p. 10. Account of FIRMIN'S Religion, p. 4. SANDII Biblioth. Antin., p. 172.

worship, which are preserved in the Church of *England*, and which are so closely incorporated with all its services, methinks, must furnish an insuperable objection against conformity, with all sincere and conscientious UNITARIANS, who would not countenance a gross corruption of the plan of devotion laid down in the New Testament, and who seek to worship God in spirit and in truth. These principles, when embraced, justly strengthen their attachment to the dissenting interest*, and must, in time, produce either material alterations in our establishment, or the separation of numbers.

The year 1773 hath afforded us one striking example of this, in the noble conduct of the pious and candid Mr. LINDSEY, in resigning his living, and in that of UNITARIANS who have formed themselves into a distinct Church under his ministry.

The most distinguished SOCINIAN writers, in *Poland*, were CRELLIUS, SMALCIUS, VOLKELIUS, SLICHTINGIUS, WOLZOGENIUS, PRZIPCOWIUS, and STANISLAUS LUBIENICIUS; persons eminent for their rank, learning, judgment, and piety. Among

* See, to this purpose, an excellent pamphlet, entitled, *A free Address to Protestant Dissenters as such: by a Dissenter.* Printed for JOHNSON, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

Among those who have elucidated and supported the SOCINIAN sentiments, in other kingdoms, must be reckoned GROTIUS: in his younger years, indeed, he attacked the SOCINIAN doctrine relative to the design and efficacy of the death of CHRIST; but, when he was answered by J. CRELLIUS, he not only never replied, but thanked CRELLIUS for his answer: and his Annotations are a complete system of SOCINIANISM, not excepting his Notes on the first Chapter of St. JOHN's Gospel*. LE CLERC, BIDLE,

* UNITARIAN Tracts, vol. I, Tract 7, p. II.

The name of the great GROTIUS has been reckoned among the SOCINIANS not only by the writer quoted above; many others, also, not merely his avowed enemies, but some celebrated *Roman Catholics*, accused him of having imbibed their sentiments. His biographer, however, employs several pages to vindicate him from the charge. He appeals to many of the Letters of that great man, in which he expresses a great dislike of the SOCINIAN sentiments, and clears himself from the suspicion of embracing them. M. DE BURIGNY acquaints us, that the celebrated BIGNON, who lived in perfect intimacy with him, denied his being a SOCINIAN. His friendship with father PETAW, the Jesuit, a man distinguished by his zeal for the orthodox faith, is considered also as a proof that this charge was unjust. The arguments, upon which the charge was grounded, I must say, in my opinion, are far from being full and convincing. His silence upon the doctrine of the Trinity, in his piece on the truth of the Christian religion, is certainly no evidence of it. His praises of CRELLIUS only

BIDLE, and the other Authors of the scarce and valuable Tracts called UNITARIAN Tracts, printed in 1691, in four small quartos; the excellent and learned Dr. LARDNER, in a *Letter concerning the Logos*,

only shew the liberality of his mind, but do not evince a conformity of sentiments; and his celebrated letter to him, occasioned by CRELLIUS's answer to his book on the *Satisfaction*, expresses little more: he plainly does not own himself convinced by it: and, in another letter, he says, "it was for prudential reasons, and by the advice of the *Protestants* in *France*, that he did not answer CRELLIUS, though he thought it easy to refute him with glory." The strongest presumption of his being a SOCINIAN arises from his interpretation of those texts which are alledged to support the pre-existence of CHRIST: but, by the same method of reasoning, CALVIN may be accused of ARIANISM. The SOCINIANS need not be solicitous on the point, as they may urge, with greater propriety and force, these interpretations of GROTIUS, on the supposition of his not being a SOCINIAN, than if they could prove that he entirely fell in with them on all points; for they may say, it is a strong presumption of the truth of their own sense of Scripture, on this head, that it appears to have suggested itself to so great a man, when explaining the Scriptures by the rules of fair criticism, though otherwise averse from their scheme. After all, it is not material to the cause of truth what side any man, eminent for learning and judgment, espoused: religious truth rests upon evidence and not authority; and one clear solid argument, in support of any scheme, is of more value than the suffrages of ten great men. See BUNGNY's *Life of GROTIUS*, p. 318—325,

Logos, printed in 1759; the judicious author of the true *Scripture Doctrine of the New Testament concerning JESUS CHRIST considered*, 1767; the learned Mr. LOWMAN, in his posthumous *Dissertations concerning the Logos and Shekinah*; Dr. FLEMING, in various pieces; Mr. LINDSEY, (whose integrity merits the highest eulogiums,) in the *Sequel to his Apology*; but above all Dr. PRIESTLY, in most of his religious tracts, and particularly in different papers in the *Theological Repository*; in which work are also some valuable pieces in opposition to the SOCINIAN scheme, as well as in defence of it.

Besides these writers in support of UNITARIAN principles, must be mentioned a lay-gentleman, whose character and zeal deserve particular notice, especially as they are not generally known. This was "HOPTON HAYNES, Esq. assayer master of the Mint under Sir ISAAC NEWTON, and afterwards deputy-teller of the Exchequer. The latter part of his life he resided in *Queen's-Square, Westminster*, where he attended the dissenters place of worship in *Long-Ditch*, now *Prince's-Street*. His religious sentiments did not always agree with those of the officiating minister and others, on the subject of the *unitarian doctrine*,

“ doctrine, for which he was at all times a most
 “ strenuous advocate.

“ He was author of several writings well known
 “ to the curious. He served many years in the
 “ Mint-office under Sir ISAAC NEWTON, and, at
 “ the time of his death, had a place in the Exche-
 “ quer. He was the most zealous UNITARIAN I
 “ ever knew, says Mr. BARON; and, in a conver-
 “ sation with him on that subject, he told me, *that*
 “ *Sir ISAAC NEWTON did not believe our Lord's pre-*
 “ *existence, being a SOCINIAN, as we call it, in*
 “ *that article: that Sir ISAAC much lamented Mr.*
 “ *(Dr.) CLARKE's embracing ARIANISM; which*
 “ *opinion, he feared, had been, and still would be,*
 “ *if maintained by learned men, a great obstruction*
 “ *to the progress of Christianity.*

“ Mr. HAYNES died November 18, 1749, aged
 “ 77. He left a book behind him, entitled, *The*
 “ *Scripture Account of the Attributes and Worship of*
 “ *GOD, and of the Character and Offices of JESUS*
 “ *CHRIST. By a candid Enquirer after Truth. Pub-*
 “ *lished at the Desire of the deceased Author.*
 “ *London: printed for J. NOON, Cheapside, &c.*
 “ *1750. Only 200 copies of this work were*
 “ *printed off; none of them were exposed to sale,*
 “ but,

“ but dispersed privately and with a sparing hand
 “ to friends*.”

The author of the article UNITAIRES, in the EN-
 CYCLOPÉDIE, enumerates other writers on this side,
 who were, as to the doctrine of the pre-existence of
 CHRIST, and on other questions, ARIANS and AR-
 MINIANS.

This writer, by confounding these denominations
 with SOCINIANS, and also by considering the latter
 as secret DEISTS, seems to have carried his ideas
 of the extensive reception and great progress of
 SOCINIANISM beyond the truth: yet what he offers
 to account for this progress seems to merit our
 attention.

“ Whether, says he, the universal and just con-
 “ tempt into which the vain, puerile, and conten-
 “ tious, science, called controversy, hath fallen,
 “ among PROTESTANTS, hath facilitated their pro-
 “ gress in the search of truth, by turning their
 “ thoughts to the most important objects, and by
 “ leading them to perceive the great extent of the
 “ intellectual sciences; whether the light of their
 “ reason hath been kindled by the sparks they ima-
 “ gined

* Sequel to LINDSEY's Apology, p. 18—23.

“ gined they saw shining from the SOCINIAN doc-
 “ trine; whether, lastly, being deceived by some
 “ lively appearances, and the collection of lumi-
 “ nous rays reflected from all parts of this doctrine,
 “ they thought they had discovered solid and de-
 “ monstrative proofs of the bold and free philoso-
 “ phical theories that characterise SOCINIANISM;
 “ it is certain, that the most learned and intelligent
 “ amongst them have, for some time, made confi-
 “ derable advances towards the ANTITRINITARIAN
 “ dogmas. Add to this, the spirit of toleration,
 “ which, happily for humanity, seems to have
 “ gained ground in all communions, CATHOLIC as
 “ well as PROTESTANT, and you have the true cause
 “ of the rapid progress SOCINIANISM has made in
 “ our days; of the deep roots it hath cast into most
 “ minds, the branches of which, continually un-
 “ folding and extending themselves, cannot fail
 “ soon to convert PROTESTANTISM in general into
 “ perfect SOCINIANISM; which, by degrees, will ab-
 “ sorb all the different systems of the erroneous,
 “ and be, as it were, the common center of agree-
 “ ment, where all the hypotheses, before this,
 “ independent of one another and inconsistent,
 “ will unite; and, if I may so express it, lose them-
 “ selves, (as the primitive elements of bodies in the
 “ universal system of nature) the particular feelings
 “ of

“ of each; forming, by their conjunction, an universal consciousness of the whole.”

Notwithstanding the truth there may be in the above remarks, yet the increasing and universal prevalence of SOCINIANISM must appear, to the contemplative mind, an extraordinary phenomenon in the religious world: for, as this author observes, the theological and philosophical doctrines of SOCINIANS have been a long time the object of the hatred, the anathemas, and the persecutions of all Protestant communities.

Many writers have animadverted upon and attacked the SOCINIAN system: and it seems to have been the design of most of them to represent SOCINIANISM in such a view as should raise an abhorrence of it in the minds of their readers, and fix an odium upon those who have espoused it.

HOORNBECK, a divine at *Utrecht*, in the last century, and “ author of a work entitled *Confutatio Socinianismi*, calls it the most pernicious heresy, “ more to be detested than any other modern one, “ that assumes the Christian name. For it attacks, “ says he, not only some particular article, but “ strikes at the soul of religion, and almost subverts “ its very foundations. Although the Papists “ greatly

“ greatly err, yet they retain many of the founda-
 “ tions of religion, which they corrupt by a super-
 “ structure of errors and superstition: but the
 “ SOCINIANS take them all away. Now, it is a
 “ much worse state entirely to want what cannot be
 “ dispensed with, than to retain the same sentiments
 “ however corrupted. Nothing is more hostile
 “ and destructive to the Christian flock than So-
 “ CINIANISM*.

“ JURIEU, a learned *French* PROTESTANT, speaks
 “ of SOCINIANISM as a conspiracy against Christian-
 “ ity in general; the greatest enemy to it that has
 “ appeared for these thousand years. We shall
 “ shew, says he, that SOCINIANISM subverts all the
 “ Christian religion, and of consequence ought not
 “ to be tolerated. The religion of the SOCINIANS
 “ is mere Deism†.” The whole book breathes
 this spirit, and is intended to put it on a level with
 Deism, nay, Paganism, and even Atheism, and to
 prove it is not entitled to toleration.

RELAND endeavours to shew that the SOCINIANS
 are friends to MAHOMETANISM, and that there is a
 U perfect

* HOORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 562,
 569.

† *Le Tableau du Socinianisme*: passim.

perfect conformity between Socinus and his disciples and MAHOMET and his followers. Not contented with this charge, he proceeds farther, and asserts, that the principle of Socinus, that the existence of God cannot be proved by reason, opens a door to Atheism and the denial of God; nay, that Socinus must have been sensible of this consequence, and have had in his heart and mind all the conclusions in which his principles end*.

An *English* writer of note and learning has given us this picture of SOCINIANISM. “The doctrines
 “ of Socinus were, by some of his followers, methodized and digested into regular systems, and, by
 “ others, defended against the various objections
 “ whether of ROMANISTS or PROTESTANTS. A
 “ scheme it was which did entirely change the whole
 “ nature and design of Christianity. It not only
 “ took in that grand point in which the SABELLIANS and ARIANS agreed, that the supreme
 “ Deity is *personally* but one, concurring also with
 “ the latter, that our blessed Saviour is not God
 “ over all, and with the former, that the Holy
 “ Spirit is only a divine influence, without any
 “ *personal subsistence*; but it went on, with ARTEMON
 “ and others, to deny that JESUS CHRIST had any
 “ real

* RELAND ON MAHOMETANISM, p. 210, 238, 239.

“ real existence before his birth of the Virgin ; and
 “ its patrons have set up private judgment as their
 “ supreme rule ; concluding, from the whole, more
 “ impiously indeed, but still more consistently,
 “ than former Heretics, that whatever is said of the
 “ *merit* and *satisfaction* of CHRIST, his *sacrifice* for
 “ sin and his *redemption* of sinners, his unchange-
 “ able *Priesthood* and *intercession* for us at God’s
 “ right-hand, has altogether a metaphorical or fi-
 “ gurative meaning, widely different from that in
 “ which the Church had always understood and
 “ made use of those expressions. To these, if we
 “ add the many other errors of this new-fangled
 “ scheme, concerning the constitution of the Chris-
 “ tian Church and the appointment of its Ministers,
 “ the efficacy of its *Sacraments* and the secret ope-
 “ rations of divine Grace, the interpretation of
 “ Scripture and the rules of Christian *obedience*, the
 “ state of the soul after death, the *resurrection* of
 “ the body, and the future judgment ; we shall
 “ have cause to say, that there never was any He-
 “ resy that did so artfully disguise so great a number
 “ of impieties as this HYDRA of SOCINIANISM ;
 “ which made so low an account of the unfathoma-
 “ ble mystery of our Redemption, that there can
 “ be little ground to wonder, if, besides the Juda-
 “ izing errors already mentioned, there should be
 “ some who apostatised (as SOCINUS himself could

“ not entirely disown) into MAHOMETANISM, or
 “ into downright ATHEISM ; even if some of those
 “ who did not openly apostatise should yet boast of
 “ their agreement with the followers of MAHOMET
 “ in their notions of the divine Unity, and their
 “ little difference in respect of CHRIST*.”

These and the like reflections on the SOCINIAN scheme are evidently designed to impress the reader with an abhorrence of those who espoused it, as purposely disseminating principles which derogate from the dignity and honour of CHRIST, or at least as persons who entertained no reverential and devotional sentiments of the Redeemer of the world. Hence the SOCINIANS were, in former as well as later times, accused of blaspheming their Lord and being enemies to CHRIST. It may not be amiss, with a view to shew how candid or just are such representations, to lay before the reader, besides the passages quoted from SOCINUS himself, a striking one from another celebrated SOCINIAN writer, viz. SMALCIUS, a Pastor of the Church at *Racow*, in a piece on the divine dignity of CHRIST, printed at *Racow*, 1608.

The author, in this tract, discourses on the miraculous conception of CHRIST; on the precepts he enjoined ;

* BERRIMAN's Hist. of the Trinitarian Controversy, p. 410, 413.

enjoined; the promises of eternal life, and of the holy spirit, he made; on his doctrine and example; death, resurrection, ascension into heaven; his dominion over all things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; and his priesthood and exaltation. From these topics, he proves and displays the great dignity and divine excellencies of JESUS CHRIST; and then concludes his view of this interesting subject in this manner:

“ How can any one deny that he is above all,
 “ blessed for ever, who surpasses all the blessed
 “ angels in glory; who enjoyeth, in the most per-
 “ fect degree, divine glory; who will advance to
 “ the glory of God all his faithful followers; and
 “ amongst them, who will come forth so many
 “ glorious forms, and whose honours shall endure
 “ for ever, will always be himself the most glorious
 “ of all. All these considerations, though they
 “ may serve but little to lead others to entertain
 “ just sentiments of the amazing dignity of
 “ CHRIST, are certainly so effectual for this pur-
 “ pose with me, and, I trust, with all (who adhere
 “ to the pure word of God,) that, if I had an hun-
 “ dred tongues, and could speak an hundred lan-
 “ guages, and were endowed with the eloquence of
 “ an angel, I could not indulge the hope of being
 “ ever able to express in words the hundredth part

“ of this great dignity ; and, the longer I fix my
 “ thoughts on this subject, the more am I carried
 “ away by the contemplation of it, and am at
 “ length fully persuaded, that all the great things
 “ we have said, concerning the divine dignity of
 “ CHRIST, bear a very small proportion to the
 “ parts of the subject of which we are ignorant. It
 “ hath pleased that Being, who is most wise, pow-
 “ erful, and benevolent, that there should exist a
 “ subject which should engage the study and en-
 “ quiries of the most penetrating minds ; of which
 “ the most eloquent tongues should discourse and
 “ sing ; and which the most unfeeling should view
 “ with wonder and astonishment : a subject, which, to
 “ study, to celebrate, and admire, all the ages, from
 “ the moment of CHRIST’S coming into the world
 “ to his second appearance, and even all eternity,
 “ will scarcely suffice.

“ Perhaps some person will cry out, that the things
 “ we have advanced, concerning the divinity and ex-
 “ cellence of CHRIST, are all true, but not sufficient ;
 “ for I have omitted that part of his dignity which
 “ he had with GOD the Father from all eternity.
 “ But may we first be allowed to request of him ;
 “ that, though he perceive we do not profess those
 “ sentiments others entertain of CHRIST, he
 “ would at least cease to accuse us of blaspheming
 “ that

“ that person whom we acknowledge to have been
 “ so great and divine. We would intimate, then,
 “ that the notions which the generality embrace
 “ concerning CHRIST, different from the senti-
 “ ments contained in this book, are so far from
 “ being consonant to truth, that it is rather evident
 “ that their notions are erroneous, absurd, and even
 “ very pernicious: for, as we have said just before,
 “ they detract from the true glory of GOD and rob
 “ men of genuine consolation; whereas, on the
 “ contrary, our opinion asserts the true glory of
 “ GOD, and displays and demonstrates to men the
 “ true principles of comfort. But we would not
 “ now, by evincing the errors, absurdities, and un-
 “ happy consequences of their sentiments, offend
 “ in the least against the love of our neighbour:
 “ we rather implore of our Lord JESUS CHRIST,
 “ on their account, that they may be brought to the
 “ true knowledge and worship of the same Lord
 “ with us. In the mean time, firmly adhering to
 “ our own faith concerning JESUS CHRIST, we
 “ will comfort ourselves with the consciousness of
 “ our own integrity, and with the authority of the
 “ holy Scriptures.

“ With heart and lips, both publicly in thy
 “ Church, and every where in private, we will
 “ praise and magnify thee, O JESUS of Nazareth,

“ our Lord, Saviour, and King ! thee, the delight
 “ of our souls, our glory, and our hope ! In cele-
 “ brating and singing thy praises, we will feed and
 “ refresh our souls in this mortal state, till thou
 “ shalt translate us from mortality to immortality,
 “ where, rescued from all fear, everlasting happi-
 “ ness awaits us ; where we shall see thee and thy
 “ Father face to face ; where we shall possess an in-
 “ heritance which will know no satiety, change, or
 “ end ; where we shall enjoy a glory no eye hath
 “ seen nor ear heard, and which it hath not entered
 “ into the the heart of man to conceive ; where
 “ thou shalt gird thyself and serve us, when thou
 “ hast caused us to sit down at meat. *Luke xii. 37.*
 “ Oh ! condescension impossible to be believed,
 “ had not truth itself spoken it, where (the thought
 “ fills us with amazement) thy Father will honour
 “ us. This we suppliantly entreat of the Lord
 “ JESUS CHRIST, to whom be all honour and glory,
 “ from all nations and in all languages, for ever
 “ and ever : Amen*.”

In the above manner do some writers speak of
 SOCINUS, and of the sentiments that are called from
 him. Other authors have written on this subject with

* SMALCII de Divinitate JESU CHRISTI. *Racov.* 1608,
 p. 151—3.

with more temper and candour. A late very learned writer, whose curious and learned disquisitions lay the Christian world under no small obligation to him, having represented the sentiments of the SABELLIANS with respect to CHRIST, adds:

“ The SOCINIANS, on the other hand, argued,
 “ from the general orthodox belief, that the Son of
 “ GOD had suffered and died; that he could not
 “ be that supreme GOD, whom all parties acknow-
 “ ledged to be impassible: *quippe Deo παθηματα*
 “ *nullo modo ascribi posse*, says Bishop BULL. And
 “ from thence they concluded (with the SABEL-
 “ LIANS) that he was a mere man, who never did
 “ exist till he was born of the Virgin MARY; but
 “ that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and
 “ for that reason was called the Son of GOD: for
 “ they did not believe, with the EBIONITES and
 “ THEODOTIANS, that he was begotten by JOSEPH.
 “ Bishop HOADLEY says of them, that they seem
 “ to be vanished, and not to have been so much as
 “ spoken of for many years; and that their inter-
 “ pretations of Scripture are universally rejected,
 “ as inconsistent with all the best rules of interpre-
 “ tation. But, however, they seem to be growing
 “ again into fashion, as to their doctrines, though
 “ they are ashamed of the name.

“ The

“ The great care of this sect was, to maintain the
 “ Unity and Impassibility of the Father ; and, in
 “ doing this, they degraded the nature and charac-
 “ ter of the Son. But they mean as well as those
 “ who see things in a different and better light ;
 “ and are forced into these principles for fear they
 “ should be obliged to admit of the Death and Suf-
 “ ferings of the supreme God ; not being satisfied
 “ with the evasions of the SABELLIANS and PSEUDO-
 “ ATHANASIANS, both which fall in with the errors
 “ of CERINTHUS*.”

The sentiments the good Archbishop TILLOTSON
 expressed, with respect to the SOCINIAN writers,
 though well known, are too singular to be omitted.

“ To do right, says he, to the writers on that
 “ side, I must own, that, generally, they are a pat-
 “ tern of the fair way of disputing and debating
 “ matters of religion, without heat and unseemly
 “ reflections upon their adversaries. They gene-
 “ rally argue matters with that temper and gravity,
 “ and with that freedom from passion and transport,
 “ which becomes a serious and weighty argument ;
 “ and for the most part they reason closely and
 “ clearly, with extraordinary guard and caution ;
 “ with

* The Apology of BENJAMIN BEN MORDECAI for
 embracing Christianity, p. 16, 18, 19. Letter I.

“ with great dexterity and decency, and yet with
 “ smartness and subtilty enough; with a very gen-
 “ tle heat and few hard words; virtues to be praised
 “ wherever they are found, yea, in an enemy, and
 “ very worthy of our imitation. In a word, they
 “ are the strongest managers of a weak cause, and
 “ which is ill founded at the bottom, that perhaps
 “ ever yet meddled with controverſy; in ſo much
 “ that ſome of the *Proteſtants* and moſt of the *Popiſh*
 “ writers, and even of the *Jefuits* themſelves, who
 “ pretend to all the reaſon and ſubtilty in the
 “ world, are, in compariſon of them, but mere
 “ bunglers. Upon the whole matter, they have
 “ this one great defect, that they want a good cauſe
 “ and truth on their ſide; which, if they had, they
 “ have reaſon, and wit, and temper enough, to de-
 “ fend it*.”

The diſcourſes, from which this paſſage is quoted,
 are deſignedly framed in oppoſition to the notions
 of the SOCINIANS on the character of CHRIST.
 The good Biſhop informed Mr. FIRMIN, that the
 calumnies of the people obliged him to publiſh
 them: he added, that he had ſincerely “ preached
 “ as he *then thought*, and *continued ſtill to think*, of
 “ thoſe points: that, however, no body’s falſe im-
 “ putations

* TILLOTSON’S Works, Vol. i. Ser. 44. Folio. Or
 Vol. iii. p. 47, 48. 12mo.

“putations should provoke him to give ill language
 “to persons who dissented *conscientiously* and for
 “*weighty reasons*: that he knew well this was the
 “case of the SOCINIANS, for whose learning and
 “dexterity he should always have a respect, as well
 “as for their sincerity and exemplariness*.”

The candid and learned Dr. JORTIN observes,
 “that Dr. TILLOTSON printed his Sermons on the
 “*Divinity* of CHRIST to vindicate himself from the
 “charge of SOCINIANISM, that is, from an accu-
 “sation entirely groundless. I have been told, he
 “says, that CRELLIUS, a SOCINIAN, and a de-
 “scendant of the more celebrated CRELLIUS, who
 “used, when he came hither, to visit the Arch-
 “bishop and to converse with him, justified him on
 “this head, and declared that TILLOTSON had of-
 “ten disputed with him in a friendly way, nay,
 “upon the subject of the TRINITY, and that he
 “was the best reasoner, and had most to say for
 “himself, of any adversary he had ever encoun-
 “tered. But then TILLOTSON had made some
 “concessions, concerning the SOCINIANS, which
 “never were, and never will be forgiven him, and
 “hath broken an antient and fundamental rule of
 “theological controversy, *allow not an adversary to*
 “have

* FIRMIN'S Life, p. 16, 17.

“ have either common sense or common honesty. The
 “ thought which is contained in the last sentence
 “ (*i. e.* of the paragraph from TILLOTSON) resem-
 “ bles that of QUINTILIAN, who says of SENECA,
 “ *Multa probanda in eo, multa etiam admiranda sunt;*
 “ *eligere modo curæ sit, quod utinam ipse fecisset.* Dig-
 “ *na enim illa natura, quæ meliora vellet, quæ quod vo-*
 “ *luit, effecit.* And again, *Velles cum suo ingenio*
 “ *dixisse, alieno judicio.* QUINT. *Inst. Orat. lib. 10.*
 “ *cap. 10. ad finem.* Now, by way of contrast, be-
 “ hold the characters of the same persons from the
 “ masterly and impartial hand of SOUTH. The
 “ SOCINIANS are impious blasphemers, whose infamous
 “ pedigree runs back from wretch to wretch, in a
 “ direct line, to the devil himself; and who are
 “ fitter to be crushed by the civil magistrate, as
 “ destructive to government and society, than to
 “ be confuted as merely Heretics in Religion.”

The candid and equitable manner in which TIL-
 LOTSON and JORTIN have spoken, will dispose the
 reader to pay the more attention to the view given
 us of the SOCINIANS by another writer.

He represents them as persons to be esteemed
 for acuteness and dexterity of thought, and as ex-
 cellently learned, especially in sacred criticism.
 “ But (he adds) that which, in my opinion, most
 “ commends

“ commends them, is the freedom and sincerity
 “ which they have all along practised in judging of
 “ the *controverted points* of Religion.

“ The opinions of the SOCINIANS (this writer
 “ subjoins) had that appearance of reason, such an
 “ agreement with all the yielded principles of Phi-
 “ losophy, whether natural or metaphysical, that,
 “ if they had been fostered by the helps, under the
 “ cover and shelter of which other denominations
 “ of Religion have made shift to subsist, SOCINIAN-
 “ ISM would have flourished and spread like that
 “ tree in the prophet DANIEL, *the height whereof*
 “ *reached to the heaven, and the sight thereof to the ends*
 “ *of the earth.* Other sects, by the favour of prin-
 “ ces or the quality of the times, have obtained
 “ an exemption from mulcts and penalties of the
 “ laws; and thus, their course not being impeded
 “ by any dams or banks, they have overspread
 “ sometimes considerable parts of particular coun-
 “ tries. If SOCINIANISM had any where enjoyed those
 “ HALCYON DAYS, its sudden irresistible progress
 “ would have been (that I may again borrow one
 “ of the sacred comparisons) as lightning that *rush-*
 “ *eth out of the East, and shineth even to the West.*
 “ Alas! on equal ground and with equal circum-
 “ stances, the combat between [unintelligible]
 “ mystery and [clear] Reason, between [seeming]
 “ contradictions,

“ contradictions, absurdities, and Impossibilities,
 “ and [a rational, obvious, accountable] faith,
 “ would have been ended*.”

But the most candid, accurate, and comprehensive view of SOCINIANISM is given us by the pen of LE CLERC: and, as it is rather scarce, I would lay it before the reader.

“ In order to judge exactly of the controversies that
 “ are among CHRISTIANS, we must distinguish, in
 “ every society, three sorts of opinions. The first are
 “ *Opinions of Religion*; by virtue whereof they be-
 “ lieve they shall be saved, and without which they
 “ do not hope for salvation in that society. The
 “ second are *Opinions of Controversy*; which consist
 “ in rejecting in one's judgment certain doctrines,
 “ which are contrary to those of the society, though
 “ salvation is not made to depend on such a rejec-
 “ tion. The third are *Opinions of Theology or Phi-*
 “ *losophy*; which are scarcely understood by any
 “ but those of the trade, and which the people ne-
 “ ver pry into or comprehend, though they are not
 “ thought to be therefore in any danger of damna-
 “ tion. There is no Christian society which does
 “ not hold these three sorts of opinions: but, to
 “ make

* An Account of Mr. FIRMIN's Religion, p. 4, 6, 7.

“ make the matter easier conceived, we shall take
 “ the SOCINIANS for an example.

I. “ The SOCINIANS lay down, for *the Doctrines*
 “ *of Religion*, that there is an eternal Being, all-wise,
 “ all-good, and all-powerful, which has created the
 “ heavens and the earth, with all that they contain,
 “ and men in particular, with a design to do them
 “ good: That men, who are come to the age of
 “ discretion, have all offended him, by not living
 “ according to the light they have, and therefore
 “ need his pardon for their sins; excepting never-
 “ theless one man, who shall be mentioned in due
 “ place: That this God had formerly revealed his
 “ will to the *Jews* by the means of his Prophets,
 “ whose books compose the volume we call the Old
 “ Testament: That afterwards he revealed it in a
 “ more perfect manner by the means of his Son,
 “ JESUS CHRIST, born of a virgin, but otherwise
 “ a man such as we are, although without sin, and
 “ assisted in a very extraordinary manner, by the
 “ Spirit of his Father: That JESUS CHRIST has
 “ caused the same truths to be published by the
 “ ministry of his Apostles, to whom he gave the
 “ Holy Spirit, and whom he sent to preach to all
 “ those that would hear them: That this revela-
 “ tion is found in the books of the New Testament,
 “ which contain all that ought to be believed con-
 “ cerning

“ cerning GOD and JESUS CHRIST, all that ought
 “ to be practised in obedience to them, and all that
 “ can be hoped or expected from them: That this
 “ JESUS, after having performed a world of mira-
 “ cles, suffered the *Jews* to fasten him to a cross,
 “ on which he died, to confirm his doctrine, to
 “ shew us a good example, and to be able to offer
 “ his blood in heaven to GOD for the expiation of
 “ our sins: That he was buried; that he rose
 “ again; that he ascended into heaven; where,
 “ after having expiated our sins, he reigns over all
 “ nature by the power which GOD his Father has
 “ given him: And that he will come to judge the
 “ living and the dead, rewarding those that have
 “ obeyed his *Gospel*, by raising their bodies to en-
 “ joy with their souls a happy immortality, and
 “ punishing the rest with pains proportionable to
 “ their sins and conformable to divine justice:
 “ That in JESUS CHRIST must be acknowledged
 “ the royal authority which he has received of his
 “ Father in heaven and in earth: That he must be
 “ obeyed; that his assistance must be implored;
 “ and that he ought to be worshipped as the only
 “ vicegerent of GOD, according to the express
 “ commandment of his Father.

“ This is what can properly be called the religion
 “ of the SOCINIANS; seeing that it is by virtue of

“ their belief of these articles, and by leading a life
 “ agreeable to the same, that they expect to be
 “ saved: for certainly the true religion of CHRIS-
 “ TIANs is that which they believe themselves obli-
 “ ged to observe in order to obtain salvation, and
 “ without which they are persuaded they could not
 “ partake of mercy. These points are so clearly
 “ contained in the holy *Scriptures*, that they glory
 “ in them, as being ever received and still be-
 “ lieved by all CHRISTIANs. They are the contents
 “ of the antient *Creeds*, and particularly of that of
 “ the *Apostles*, which is much plainer than the rest.
 “ Wherefore, in order to absolve or condemn
 “ them, with respect to what is called their Reli-
 “ gion, it must first be considered, whether this be
 “ sufficient or not to obtain the remission of sins:
 “ and then it must be brought to a determination,
 “ whether a man who sincerely reads the holy
 “ *Scripture*, and that finds in it no more than these
 “ points, who believes and observes them with all
 “ his heart, being likewise further prepared to be-
 “ lieve and observe whatever he should discover
 “ in them besides; whether a man, I say, with this
 “ persuasion, and disposed after this manner, were
 “ worthy of the mercy of God.

II. “ Secondly, the SOCINIANS have *Opinions*
 “ of *Controversy*, which consist, for example, in re-
 “ jecting

“jecting what is taught among other CHRISTIANS
 “touching a Trinity of persons in one divine es-
 “sence, whereof the second is begotten by the
 “first, and the third proceeds from the other two:
 “touching the hypostatical union of the second of
 “these persons with the human nature of JESUS
 “CHRIST, yet so as that the other two divine per-
 “sons are not incarnated: touching the satisfaction
 “of JESUS CHRIST; who, according to the great-
 “est part of other CHRISTIANS, has undergone,
 “at his death, a punishment equivalent to what
 “all mankind had deserved; so that the justice of
 “God being satisfied to the utmost, he requires
 “nothing else of men but that, by faith, they accept
 “this satisfaction which JESUS CHRIST has made
 “for them.

“The UNITARIANS reject these and the like
 “doctrines, because they believe they are not re-
 “vealed, nor at all to be found in the holy *Scripture*, without greatly forcing the literal signifi-
 “cation, and joining several scholastic ideas to those
 “which the holy *Scripture* affords us. They do
 “their best endeavour to answer all the passages
 “objected to them, and to prove their own senti-
 “ments by other passages, as may be seen in their
 “*Catechism*. Nay, they believe that these doctrines
 “are contrary to right reason, which revelation

“ does not destroy but suppose. If they have much
 “ ado to bring themselves off in many passages that
 “ are objected to them, and if they wrest some others
 “ as they are reproached to have done, it must be
 “ confessed that the things in question are very
 “ nice and difficult, being mysteries that are above
 “ human reason. It is certain, that they are con-
 “ troversies which may even puzzle the wisest, as
 “ experience has shewn, since all CHRISTIANS
 “ have almost always disputed about them. But,
 “ however this may be, the SOCINIANS do not
 “ make their religion to consist in rejecting what
 “ other CHRISTIANS believe concerning these
 “ doctrines, as if it were absolutely necessary to
 “ reject them expressly in order to be saved: in
 “ their judgement, one might be ignorant of all
 “ these disputes without being the less acceptable
 “ to Almighty God.

“ Here then it ought to be examined, whether
 “ those things wherein we differ from them be of
 “ as great consequence as those wherein we agree;
 “ and whether it be just to damn people, that agree
 “ with us in those *Articles of Religion* which we have
 “ specified, merely for the sake of their *Opinions*
 “ of *Controversy* about difficult and obscure sub-
 “ jects.

III, "The SOCINIANS have likewise *theological*
 "or *philosophical Opinions*; such as what they be-
 "lieve concerning the finishing the pains of the
 "damned; which, according to them, are not to
 "be eternal: that it is contradictory to hold God
 "may foresee future contingents: that the ex-
 "istence of God cannot be concluded from the
 "contemplation of nature: and such other mat-
 "ters.

"But they do not impose a necessity on any Di-
 "vine, and much less on the people, to take sides in
 "these questions. They look on these, and the
 "like as difficult problems, where men may follow
 "different sentiments; so that, supposing all they
 "say about them were confuted, they think their
 "Religion would not be, for all that, the less true
 "in itself, or the less safe from all attacks.

"To judge solidly therefore of their doctrines,
 "we ought, as I have said, to examine those which
 "I called *Doctrines of Religion*: and if we believe,
 "that, together with a CHRISTIAN life, they may
 "be sufficient to obtain the mercy of God, these
 "people may be securely tolerated till God is
 "pleased to grant them greater light. After the
 "same manner ought we to consider all the other
 "controversies which are among CHRISTIANS;

“ and, if we found that every sect retained the
 “ essentials, we should pardon all their *theological*
 “ *Disputes and Speculations*, provided that each of
 “ them did pardon the rest; for, to have peace, it
 “ must be desired by both sides*.”

The above quotations serve as specimens of the representations of SOCINIANISM given by PROTESTANT writers: I will now lay before the Reader the view which some authors of the ROMAN CATHOLIC Church afford us of this scheme. They trace SOCINIANISM to the original principles from which it arose; and these principles must reflect honour upon it, in the judgment of every consistent PROTESTANT, if they be truly assigned.

One of them represents it as the opinion of the SOCINIANS, that there is no infallible judge or interpreter of the sense of Scripture, and that consequently it must be discovered by the rules of criticism and the light of reason. “ SOCINUS and
 “ his disciples, therefore, (says he,) employed themselves in seeking in the Scriptures the System of
 “ Religion which JESUS CHRIST came to teach
 “ men; and this it is which produced all the Com-
 “ mentaries

* SOCINIANISM truly stated, 1705. UNITARIAN Tracts, Vol. v.

“ mentaries on the Scriptures that form the *Biblio-*
 “ *theca Polonica*.

“ SocINUS and his disciples, pretending to fol-
 “ low, in the interpretation of the New Testament,
 “ the rules of Criticism and the principles of Rea-
 “ son, explained all the New Testament in a way
 “ intelligible to reason, and understood in a meta-
 “ phorical sense what reason could not comprehend.
 “ By this means they retrenched Christianity of all
 “ its mysteries, and reduced to mere metaphors
 “ the sublime truths that reason could not under-
 “ stand.

“ The general cause of all their errors is this
 “ fundamental principle, which SocINUS borrowed
 “ from the Reformed, *viz.* that the New Testament
 “ alone contains the Doctrine of JESUS CHRIST,
 “ and that men ought to interpret it agreeably to
 “ the principles of Reason and the rules of Cri-
 “ ticism*.

The other Author says almost the same thing.
 “ All the errors of the UNITARIANS flow from the
 “ same source: they are necessary consequences
 “ of the principles upon which SocINUS built all

X 4

“ his

* DICTIONNAIRE DES HERESIES, Vol. ii. p. 521, 522.

“ his *Theology*. These principles, which are like
 “ wise those of the CALVINISTS, from whom he
 “ borrowed them, are, first, that the Divinity of the
 “ Scriptures can be proved only by reason: Se-
 “ condly, that every man has a right to do it; and
 “ it is expedient that he should follow his own judge-
 “ ment in the interpretation of these Scriptures,
 “ without resting upon the authority of the Church
 “ or of tradition: Thirdly, that all the opinions of
 “ Antiquity, the harmony of all the Fathers, the
 “ decisions of the antient councils, furnish no
 “ proof of the truth of any sentiment: from
 “ whence it necessarily follows, that we have no
 “ occasion to be concerned, when they propose any
 “ thing in matters of Religion, whether there were
 “ in antiquity any who embraced it or not.

“ If we reflect a little on the purport of these
 “ propositions and upon the nature of the human
 “ mind, we shall easily perceive, that such princi-
 “ ples are capable of leading it astray into very re-
 “ mote and unhappy consequences; and, the first
 “ step being once taken, there is no knowing where
 “ men will stop. So it has happened to the UNI-
 “ TARIANS, as, in the course of this article, will be
 “ be indisputably proved: wherein we shall find
 “ the use and application they have made of these
 “ principles in their polemical disputes with the
 “ PROTESTANTS,

“ PROTESTANTS, and to what they have conducted
 “ them. It will be, I think, an object highly in-
 “ teresting, to Readers who are pleased with such
 “ subjects, to see with what subtilty these Sectarists
 “ explain in their own favour divers passages of
 “ Scripture, which the CATHOLICS and PROTEST-
 “ ANTS oppose to them; with what art they escape
 “ from those that bear hard upon them; with what
 “ force they, in their turn, make an attack; with
 “ what a dexterous and subtle logic they know how
 “ to perplex a question in appearance very simple,
 “ to multiply the difficulties attending it, to disco-
 “ ver the weakness of their adversaries arguments,
 “ to retort them upon them, and to annihilate the
 “ the great distance by which they are separated
 “ from the orthodox; in one word, how, in reject-
 “ ing by degrees the doctrines which are opposite
 “ to reason, and by retaining only those which agree
 “ with it and with their hypotheses, they have at last
 “ insensibly formed a Religion to their own taste,
 “ which is at bottom, as I have already intimated,
 “ only mere DEISM very artfully disguised.

“ I will finish this article (says our author, after
 “ having given a full detail of the *theological* and
 “ *philosophical* opinions of the SOCINIANS) with a
 “ reflection, the truth of which every intelligent
 “ Reader will perceive. The CATHOLIC, APOS-
 “ TOLIC

" POLIC, and ROMAN Religion, is incontestibly the
 " only good, the only certain, the only sure one;
 " but this Religion, at the same time, exacts an en-
 " tire submission of their reason in those that
 " embrace it. When there happens to be in this
 " Communion a man of a restless, seditious, and
 " discontented mind, he begins with setting him-
 " self up as a judge of the truth of the doctrines
 " proposed to his belief; and, not finding in the
 " objects of Faith a degree of evidence suitable to
 " their nature, he becomes a PROTESTANT: he
 " very soon perceives the incoherence of the prin-
 " ciples that characterise PROTESTANTISM; he
 " seeks in SOCINIANISM a solution of his difficul-
 " ties, and becomes a SOCINIAN: the difference
 " between SOCINIANISM and DEISM is scarcely
 " perceptible, and one step more renders him a
 " DEIST: but as DEISM itself is, as we have al-
 " ready said, a Religion derived from false in-
 " ferences, he insensibly hurries into PYRRHONISM;
 " this is such a state of violence to the mind, and
 " so mortifying to self-love, that it is incompatible
 " with the nature of the Soul. In the end, he falls
 " into ATHEISM, a condition truly dreadful, but
 " which secures to the man an unhappy tranquility,
 " we can entertain no hope we shall ever see him
 " renounce*."

Some

* ENCYCLOPEDIE, Article UNITAIRES.

Some persons, strongly prejudiced against the SOCINIAN Scheme, will probably join issue in the above conclusion, and be pleased to see SOCINIANISM represented as naturally terminating in ATHEISM: but it will diminish this satisfaction, surely, if they recollect that PROTESTANTISM itself is equally involved in the truth and odium of this conclusion, and that it is evidently the meaning of the author, that there is no consistent medium between SOCINIANISM and POPERY.

The specimens I have given, from the works of SOCINUS, of his Creed and of his methods of supporting it, will assist the Reader to judge of the propriety and justness of the reflexions on SOCINIANISM I have collected from the above-mentioned Authors. It must, I think, strike him, that the writers who have spoken of it with acrimony have greatly deviated from that good temper PROTESTANTS should exercise towards one another, and discovered very little of that liberality of spirit that should animate the enquirers after truth.

They, whose sentiments are very remote from the SOCINIAN Scheme, if they be friends of truth, ought to consider this opposition to the orthodox system as not a little useful to it. For, if their system be supported by evidence, the investigation of
its

its articles and the canvassing of its principles must, in the end, serve to fix the reception of it upon a firmer bottom; and its friends must deem themselves happy in the opportunity afforded them, by the reasonings of the SOCINIANS, to ascertain more clearly the nature and proofs of their Faith, and to support it by defences which would have been otherwise less necessary, and not therefore have excited attention or have met with so cordial a reception: so that their cause, if it be the cause of truth, must have derived considerable advantages from the promulgation of a scheme so different from theirs. But, if it be founded only on erroneous interpretations of texts, and on weak fallacious reasoning, no lover of truth can, merely because it has been his own Faith, wish its continued reputation and influence; but must rather rejoice in the detection of its falsehood.

This work may probably fall into the hands of some, who will be struck with astonishment at the view it affords of the rapid progress the *Polonian* Churches and SOCINIAN Writers made, in rejecting and discarding those corruptions of CHRISTIANITY, as they may judge them, which other PROTESTANTS tenaciously retained: they will be surprized to see to what a degree of purity and perfection they carried the Reformation. They discovered
certainly

certainly a noble freedom of mind, in rising so greatly superior to the influence of long established principles and the force of general custom. And if such a temper of mind be not favourable to the discovery of truth, it is not easy to say what is; especially as their laboured works, their accurate and close reasonings seem to shew that they were not rash and precipitate in their conclusions.

And though, in their peculiar sentiments, they should have erred, though they should have carried their refinements too far, yet it is amazing, I will add, and it was laudable, that they should have so entirely discarded human authority in Religion, and have not only *pleaded* the principles of PROTESTANTS against POPERY, but have *acted* upon them in the examination of the principles other PROTESTANTS adhered to. Certainly, they were the most consistent and perfect PROTESTANTS of their day: and, in this particular instance, I will venture to say, that, considering the errors of the times and the different spirit that then prevailed, they merit our admiration; and, in the propriety and consistency of their conduct, they furnish an example for our imitation.

It is a pleasing and delightful spectacle, to see a set of PROTESTANTS, in an age when religious authority

thority was, as it were, only *transferred* from the *Pope* to other hands, and when the established Creeds were only exchanged; it is a pleasing spectacle to see then a set of **CHRISTIANS**, true to the authority of their Lord, acting upon these principles, that there is no head but **CHRIST**, and no infallible Creed but that which the Scriptures exhibit; and therefore applying themselves solely to understand the sacred writings.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER IV.

An Account of the Works of SOCINUS.

SOCCINUS, during his residence in a village near Cracow, employed five and twenty years in composing a variety of Treatises, little Pieces, and Relations of different Disputations. They were printed at different times; some were published in his life-time, some after his death; and the Collection of them, in two volumes, folio, forms part of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum**.

A more particular enumeration of them is necessary, to give an idea of the diligence of their Author, of the design of his labours, and the reception they have met with from the world.

In

* ENCYCLOPÉDIE, Art. UNITAIRES. For an Account of this Collection and the other Authors that form it see the APPENDIX, Number II.

In the year 1562 he published a *short Explanation of the Beginning of the first Chapter of JOHN's Gospel*. This was ascribed, through mistake, by ZANCHIUS, BEZA, and some *Polish* writers, to LÆLIUS SOCINUS; but SOCINUS enumerates it amongst his own works. Soon after its publication, it was translated into the *Polish* language. An edition of this, with some other small pieces of SOCINUS's, was printed at *Racow*, in twelves, 1618. It was translated into *Dutch* 1664. Archbishop TILLOTSON animadverts upon the sense SOCINUS ascribes to the different clauses of this passage, in his celebrated *Sermons on the Divinity of CHRIST*.

In the year 1570 he published, without his name, for the use of some person of rank, his treatise *De Authoritate Sacræ Scripturæ*. He afterwards translated it into *Latin*; and, in 1588, an edition was printed at *Seville* by LAZARUS FERRERIUS, a Jesuit, with the permission of the superior, under the name of R. P. DOMINICUS LOPEZIUS, of the Society of JESUS. He spoke of himself as the Author of the work; but, by applauding in the preface some sentiments contrary to those advanced in the book, he betrayed himself. CLOPPENBURGIUS imagines that the names of the author, the place, and the printer, were fictitious, and says, that some, from the nature of the type, asserted it was printed
at

at *Amsterdam*, by CORNELIUS NICOLAUS, a celebrated printer of those times. In the year 1611 it was printed at *Racow*; and in the same year CONRAD VORSTIUS published an edition of it; to which he prefixed a preface, and subjoined notes on three difficult paragraphs in it by some Divines of *Basil*. A translation of it into *Dutch*, with notes, was published in 1623 by THEODORE RAPHAEL CAMPHUSIUS: a second edition of this translation was printed at *Racow* with VORSTIUS's preface. It was translated into *French* by NICOLAUS BERNAUD, a gentleman of *Dauphiny*, with the remarks of the *Basil* Divines.

The best edition of this work is that of *Steinfurt*, 1611; and this is particularly scarce. The superiority of this edition consisteth partly in a more plain and distinct division of the whole work, which in the former editions was thrown only into six, but in this is divided into eleven chapters. In one part there are added some quotations from ecclesiastical history; and some verses of an *Italian* poet, with which SOCINUS closed the work, are illustrated by a short commentary. In the margin and at the head of the chapters there are brief notes inserted to assist the memory and to point out the series of the discourse. Besides these improvements, the *Latin* style is rendered more clear and smooth. VORSTIUS fell under

der a severe censure for re-publishing a piece ascribed to so obnoxious a pen. He labours, in his preface, to exculpate himself, by declaring his ignorance of the author; by pleading the general importance and utility of the work; by obviating the objections against particular expressions in it, as conveying or insinuating some very erroneous sentiments; and by urging the propriety of the orthodox availing themselves of the works of the heretics, upon those general subjects about which they are both agreed, as herein they would only imitate the Apostle PAUL and the Fathers, the former of whom quotes the profane poets, and the latter borrowed from the pagan philosophers.

The Bishop of St. David's, Dr. SMALLBROOKE, says, that GROTIUS, in the composition of his book of the Truth of the Christian Religion, was, among several other authors, more especially assisted by the valuable performance of a writer otherwise justly of an ill fame, viz. FAUSTUS SOCINUS's little book *De Authoritate S. Scripturæ*, A. 1611, Edit. VORST*. The illiberal manner of this encomium serves to heighten our ideas of the merit of the work, which forces commendation from one who could not

* Dr. SMALLBROOK's Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's, 1729, p. 34.

not speak of the Author without an ungenerous reflection. A translation of this performance into *English* was published by Mr. E. COOMBE, a Clergyman of the Church of *England*, in the year 1731, with this title, *An Argument for the Authority of the Holy Scripture, from the Latin of SOCINUS, after the Steinfurst copy.*

To the edition of the above work at *Racow*, 1611, was added a very little piece, entitled, *A Summary of the Christian Religion*, first written in *Italian*, afterwards translated into *Latin*. It exhibits a concise view of his sentiments concerning the method of our Salvation: it was written about the year 1574, and delivered in M. S. by the Author to HIERONYMUS MARLIANUS, a Minister of the CALVINIST persuasion at *Basil*. In 1594 ELIAS ARCISSEVIUS, a *Polish* Knight, Baron of *Smigla*, and Pastor of the Church there, published the celebrated piece of SOCINUS *de Salvatore*. It was written almost twenty years before this by way of reply to a discourse which COVETUS, a Pastor of the *French* Church at *Basil*, had drawn up to support the common sentiments about the manner in which the Death of CHRIST operated for our Salvation, and to refute the notions of SOCINUS on this subject. This publication was accompanied by two prefaces; one drawn up by the Editor in a spirit of serious and fervent zeal,

the other by SOCINUS, containing a relation of the circumstances and incidents which gave birth to this work. In this treatise the piece of COVETUS, to which it is an answer, is inserted; in printing which SOCINUS declares he was scrupulously faithful and exact. This Disputation was re-printed at *Franeker*, 1611, with a Refutation by SIBRAND LUBERT, Professor of Divinity, and in *Dutch*, 1654, in 4to.

In 1610 there was laid before the public the *Disputation concerning the State of the first Man, or of his Immortality before the Fall*. This publication contains the ten arguments of FRANCIS PUCCIUS, to prove that man was originally created immortal, written at *Basil*, June 4, 1577: an Answer to these Arguments by SOCINUS: PUCCIUS's Defence of his Arguments, dated July, 1577: a full Refutation of this Defence, written at *Zurick*, Jan. 1578: and a prefatory dedication to Prince MAURICE, Landgrave of *Hesse*, by the Editor, HIERONYMUS MOSCOROVIVS, a *Polish* Knight, of an illustrious family.

In 1578 SOCINUS published the posthumous Dialogues of SEBASTIAN CASTALIO, on Predestination, Election, Free-Will, and Faith, under the name of FELIX TARPPIO URLEVETANUS, with a preface by himself.

The

The Answer to the Theses of FRANCIS DAVID was written in the year 1578 or 1579, and was published in the year 1580, in a Defence of FRANCIS DAVID, (of which PALÆOLOGUS and his friends were the Authors,) with a piece of DAVID's drawn up by way of reply to it under this title, *A Confutation of FAUSTUS's Answer*: there was an imperfect and mutilated edition of it in the *Hungarian* tongue in 1579. The most complete edition of this controversy was published by SOCINUS himself in 1595, containing an answer also to the objections of BLANDRATA and to the above-mentioned Confutation. It is introduced by a preface, addressed to all the UNITARIAN Ministers in *Transylvania*, to excuse the delays by which this publication had been deferred for FIFTEEN years, and to vindicate his conduct from those false imputations that had been cast upon it in a piece published with the names of the UNITARIAN Brethren. This work made its appearance from the press at the expence of JOHANNES KISKA, a *Polish* Knight, the lord and proprietor of seventy towns and cities and four hundred cantons, and a patron of many UNITARIAN Churches in *Lithuania* and *Podlachia*.

In 1580 SOCINUS drew up a Dissertation on Baptism; the design of which is to shew that the Institution of Baptism is not of perpetual obligation,

Or at least not binding on such as, born of CHRISTIAN parents, have, by some other outward acts, professed themselves CHRISTIANS. To this treatise were added answers to the remarks of DUDITH, and a reply to the observations of MARTINUS CZECHOVICIUS, a Minister at *Wilna*, in an Appendix to his book on PÆDOBAPTISM. It was printed at *Racow*, 1613, 8vo. and in *Dutch* 1632, 8vo and 4to. Among the Epistles of SOCINUS there are also two upon the same subject.

The Churches of *Poland* having received an exhortatory Letter from ANDREAS VOLANUS, of *Lithuania*, in 1579, on the subjects of the *Nature and Expiation* of CHRIST, SOCINUS was urged by the Brethren to draw up an answer to it. He complied with their request; but, as he was allowed only a few days for the work, the messenger who brought the Letter from VOLANUS being obliged to return with the utmost speed, he called it an extemporary Answer, and declined affixing his name to it.

This was his first performance after he came into *Poland*. In 1588 he revised it, corrected it, and offered it to the public eye, with a Dedication to JOHANNES KISKA, which concludes with these sentiments. “ I offer and dedicate to you, illustrious
“ trious

“trious and magnificent Sir, this fruit of my la-
 “bours: not to solicit your patronage of what I
 “advance, (for divine truth doth not want human
 “patronage, and where I depart from it I do not
 “wish to be supported,) but to engage and quicken
 “your attention in reading and studying these
 “things here debated. For it becomes you more
 “ardently to search after heavenly truth, in as much
 “as you surpass in wealth the other members of
 “our Church in this kingdom; that you may ex-
 “ert all your power to promote and spread it,
 “having discovered the truth by your own inves-
 “tigation and not that of others. God grant, that
 “despising all other things, you may ever solely
 “devote yourself to his glory.”

To this piece was added an Answer to all that
 VOLANUS had objected, written in 1583, and pub-
 lished, as well as the former, without his name in
 1588. It was dedicated to BLANDRATA; an
 Epistle to whom on the subject is extant among the
 Letters of SOCINUS*. This work was published in
 Dutch in 1664, 4to and 8vo.

The next work of SOCINUS was an Exposition of
 the seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans,
 Y 4 written

* SOCINI Opera, Vol. i. p. 494.

written at the request of JOHN NIEMOJEVIUS, a *Polonian* Knight and Judge, and afterwards an UNITARIAN Minister. This was printed at *Cracow*, 1583, with a Letter of NIEMOJEVIUS on this Exposition and SOCINUS's Answer to this Letter, and at *Racow*, 1612, 8vo. The question on which that disputation turns is, *whether the Apostle speaks in his own Person now renewed by the Spirit of CHRIST or not.* NIEMOJEVIUS supported the affirmative side of the question; but at length, convinced by the arguments of SOCINUS, retracted his sentiments, and afterwards espoused and defended the negative. The mention of this work reminds me of a striking occurrence relative to the controversy about the sense of this chapter. The sentiments of SOCINUS on the subject were warmly debated in the Synod of *Lublin*, 1589. Some defended them, but a greater number of Ministers opposed them. One of them, whose name was NICOLAS ZITINIUS, was requested to explain the chapter in a manner different from SOCINUS, and accordingly argued the matter strongly: but, coming to the words in which the Apostle gives GOD thanks on account of his deliverance, he stood stock still like one astonished, and then recovering himself said, "What is this deliverance? What is the benefit which called forth such grateful acknowledgements from the Apostle? Was it that he was necessarily de-
tained

“ tained in so great a servitude of sin? I can by
 “ no means approve of this notion. I therefore,
 “ said he, in like manner, give thanks to the Father
 “ of lights, that it hath pleased him that the light of
 “ Truth should arise upon my mind, which is now
 “ freed from error.” He immediately adopted and
 skilfully defended the opposite explanation: when
 they, whose cause he undertook, were amazed and
 reproved him, he answered, that he could not resist
 the convictions of his judgment. This event greatly
 contributed to the propagation of the sentiments of
 SOCINUS on this point*.

An Apology or Answer for the RACOVIANs
 against the book of PALÆOLOGUS, entitled a De-
 fence of the true Opinion concerning the civil Ma-
 gistrate, with a Preface addressed to PALÆOLOGUS,
 was published in 1581, 8vo. PRZIPCOWIUS speaks
 of this treatise thus. “ SOCINUS himself, in other
 “ respects an incomparable man, in that contro-
 “ versy (*viz.* concerning the Rights, Duties and
 “ Powers, of the Magistrate) was wavering and am-
 “ biguous: but yet you would think him leaning
 “ towards the vulgar opinion that then prevailed in
 “ the church, Whether he acted thus from the in-
 “ ward sentiments of his own mind, or through
 “ tenderness to the weakness of men, or a fear of
 “ giving

* Vita SOCINI.

“ giving offence, may be justly doubted. This you
 “ will easily perceive, which he himself confesses,
 “ that the question was never thoroughly discussed
 “ and considered by him: for few traces of this
 “ appear in his answer to PALÆOLOGUS. Nor does
 “ he elsewhere deny his unwillingness to engage
 “ in this controversy: therefore, contrary to his
 “ usual manner, he frequently keeps off from the
 “ main point in the question, and stays to refute
 “ the assertions of his adversary: neither does he
 “ oppose the cause or the opinion of his adversary,
 “ but his adversary himself; as if the cause were not
 “ good that had a bad advocate. Nor does he
 “ conceal it, that the cause of his adversary would
 “ admit a better defence, and yet he seldom cor-
 “ rects the unskilfulness of his opponent; that it
 “ may be suspected his design was not so much to
 “ refute the opinion, as to weaken the authority, of
 “ PALÆOLOGUS*.”

In the year 1583 were offered to the public view
 his Animadversions upon the theological Assertions
 in the Lectures of the College of *Posnania* concern-
 ing the TRI-UNE GOD: together with some short
 tracts on points belonging to the Christian Religion;
viz. 1. An Explanation of the Passages alledged by
 some

* S. PRZIPCOWII Cogitationes Sacræ, &c. p. 689,
 sol. 2.

noble Person to prove the Personality of the Holy Spirit. 2. Extemporary Animadversions on a Paper of JOHN NIEMOJEVIUS against a Part of the Disputation *De Servatore*. 3. Notes on a Paper of N. N. concerning the Reign of CHRIST on Earth. 4. Notes on a Paper of EBERHARD SPRANGENBERG concerning the two Beasts in the Revelations. 5. A Reply to the Objections or Articles of JOHN CUTENUS, an evangelic Minister. 6. A short Discourse on the Reason why Faith in the Gospel is required and Unbelief forbidden, and concerning the Reward annexed to Faith and the Punishment threatened to Unbelief. This was drawn up at first in *Italian*, and then translated into *Latin* by SMALCIUS, an UNITARIAN Minister. It was printed also in 1612 and 1654, 12mo. and in *Dutch* in 1649, 4to. 7. A Piece against the CHILIASTS concerning the Reign of CHRIST for a thousand Years on Earth. 8. A very short Disputation concerning the Flesh of CHRIST against the MEMNONITES. And, lastly, two Letters of JOHN NIEMOJEVIUS on the Sacrifice and Invocation of CHRIST, with SOCINUS's Answers to them.

The first and other of those tracts were published again in 1611, and a third time in 1618 at *Racow*.

SOCINUS

SOCINUS, in the year 1584, composed a Defence of his Strictures on the Assertions of the *Posnanian* College. against GABRIEL EUTROPIUS, a Canon in that College. In the end there are some things wanting, which the Author did not finish; nor was it printed till the year 1618; when HIERONYMUS MOSCOROVIVS published it in 8vo with a Preface. He says of it, “ This is a work in which you may
 “ discern the genius, judgment and learning of the
 “ Author, his remarkable dexterity in disputa-
 “ tions, and his great candour in his treatment of
 “ his opponents: for although such be the nature
 “ of his writings that these excellencies are conspi-
 “ cuous in all, yet here he seems to have out-done
 “ himself. His own judgment of this work is not
 “ to be concealed; for in his life-time, on the men-
 “ tion of this performance, in his usual modest
 “ manner, he said, that there were none of his
 “ works that so little displeased him*.”

In the Synod of *Chmelnicia* SOCINUS held a dispute with CHRISTIANUS FRANKEN, formerly a Jesuit at *Rome*, but then the master of the public school in that town. The question debated was, *Whether, since CHRIST was not GOD in the highest sense, he were to be worshipped with religious adoration.* FRANKEN published an account of this debate; but

* SOCINI Opera, Vol. ii. p. 625.

but as he himself acknowledged to several persons, he rather endeavoured to give a representation of what SOCINUS ought to have said, agreeably to his own sentiments, than a narrative of the arguments actually advanced by him in a debate on the worship of CHRIST; this induced SOCINUS to draw up an *Account of the Disputation*, which was published in 1618, 8vo. with some *Notes and Answers* to what FRANKEN had advanced, and also some *Corrections* of the things he had represented SOCINUS as saying.

This is the place for mentioning, among other works of SOCINUS, *Fragments of a fuller Answer* he had prepared to FRANCIS DAVID on the Invocation of CHRIST. Six chapters of these Fragments are extant; the rest are lost: A Fragment of *Strictures on a Piece by some anonymous Author on the Difference between the Old and New Testaments: Some Questions of FRANCIS DAVID, and the Answer of SOCINUS to them: ANTITHESES*, collected by him from the Disputation between him and FRANCIS DAVID: *THESES*, in which is explained the Opinion of FRANCIS DAVID concerning the Office of CHRIST, together with the ANTITHESES of the Church: *Some Hints to be attended to in the Dispute concerning the Invocation of CHRIST: A Piece concerning the Revelations and the Testimonies produced from that Book against those who entirely deny the Invoca-*
tion

tion of CHRIST: A Piece against the SEMI-JUDAIZERS: And three Letters of MARTINUS SEIDELIUS to the UNITARIAN Church at *Cracow*, with the Answers of SOCINUS to them.

In 1584 ERASMUS JOHANNIS, an ARIAN Minister, and Pastor of a Church at *Claudiopolis*, came to *Cracow*, and requested permission to offer to the UNITARIAN Churches the reasons that kept him from embracing the opinion that there was no only begotten Son of GOD before the man JESUS of *Nazareth* was born of the Virgin MARY. The Churches gave him leave, and with his approbation committed the province of answering his arguments to one of their brethren; and the choice fell upon SOCINUS, who disputed with ERASMUS two days in a calm and affectionate manner. ERASMUS, during his stay at *Cracow*, drew up and sent to SOCINUS the heads of this debate: SOCINUS, upon reading them, found that ERASMUS had mistaken some things he had advanced, and had not exactly represented others. This induced him to draw up a refutation of the arguments and reasonings offered by ERASMUS to prove that CHRIST was the only begotten Son of GOD before he was born of the Virgin MARY. This was printed at *Racow* 1598, 8vo. with a prefatory dedication to HIERONY-
MUS

MUS MOSCOROVIUS. To this work was added a Letter of ERASMUS's with SOCINUS's Reply.

In 1586 SOCINUS was the Editor of an ARISTOTELIAN Scheme of Doctrines, illustrated with theological Examples, for the use of CHRISTIAN schools, by GRATIAN PROSPER.

At *Gerapolis*, in 1591, 4to, with the fictitious name of GRATIAN TURPIO, of *Gerapolis*, and at *Racow*, 1611, with the true name of SOCINUS, was published a *Synopsis on our Justification by JESUS CHRIST*. In this treatise we meet with two Synopses of our Justification before God through CHRIST. 2. Theses concerning Justification. 3. A Dialogue concerning Justification by N. N. with the Notes of F. SOCINUS. 4. Fragments on Justification. 5. A Piece on Faith and Works, as they relate to our Justification: from the *Italian* of the celebrated N. N. 6. Theses concerning the Cause and Ground of that Faith in Man towards God by which the Scriptures declare he is justified.

In 1593 he published in the *Polish* language, into which it had been translated from the *Latin* of SOCINUS by PETER STATORIUS, his Refutation of a Treatise which JACOB VUJEKIUS, a Jesuit, had published, concerning the Divinity of the Son of
God.

GOD and the Holy Spirit. In this work he also refuted what BELLARMIN had offered on the same subject. The same work was printed in *Latin* with the Author's Preface 1595. This work was published without his name. In the conclusion of this performance he promised, if GOD granted him leisure and health, to collect together and publish a view of the arguments and reasons derived from the Scriptures in support of his own opinion on the subject. But whether he executed his design, or whether the work were lost in the plunder of his papers that happened 1598, is unknown.

A Defence of his Disputation on the seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans* appeared 1595. It was intended as a reply to the strictures of N. N. a CALVINIST Minister, communicated to him by NICHOLAS BERNAUDUS, an eminent physician. It was re-published 1618, 8vo. and in *Dutch* 1684, 8vo.

The piece of SOCINUS against ATHEISM, in which he undertook to refute the arguments of some distinguished person, and other M.S.S. were lost and destroyed in the plunder of his effects. His writings that remained, after this havoc, were the Fragment of a first Catechism, which was not published before it appeared in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*.

Polonorum. A treatise to shew that those who are called the EVANGELIC, in the kingdom of *Poland* and dukedom of *Lithuania*, and are lovers of real piety, ought to join themselves to those Churches in the same countries who are called ARIANS or EBIONITES. This performance was prepared for the press at the desire of a noble and learned person, who professed a great regard for SOCINUS. It was written in the year 1599; first published in *Polish*; and there was subjoined to it an Appendix, concerning the defect of discipline in the Church of the EVANGELICAL, and the reasons why that Church was daily decreasing, and that of those stiled ARIANS increasing. It was after the Author's death printed in *Dutch* and *Latin* at *Franckar*, with this title: *The Duty of a Christian Man amidst the modern Controversies about Religion: i.e. To what Assembly, amongst all those who differ in Religion, he ought to join himself. A little Book very useful at this Time: written by an anonymous Friend of Truth.* Printed by the Permission of the *Pope* and of the *Catholic King* at *Amsterdam*, 1610. It was also printed at *Racow*, 1611, 8vo. The first *Dutch* edition being suppressed, it was translated from *Latin* into *Dutch*, and printed in the *Netherlands*, 1630, 4to. In this piece SOCINUS lays it down as a fundamental principle, that, to continue in the practice of no sin repugnant to the Gospel doctrine is necessary, in

Z order

order to attain to the kingdom of God. Having established this point, he endeavours to shew, in the second place, that the religious system of the EVANGELIC contained some doctrines and opinions which would scarcely permit those who embraced them to live free from the practice of all sin: In the third place, he points out some things, allowed by their principles, which are contrary to the precepts of CHRIST. Fourthly, he aims to prove that they held many errors, which naturally obscured and obstructed the true way of Salvation. And, fifthly, he argues that there were many doctrinal mistakes in their scheme which, such is the fruitfulness of error, tended easily to produce others more important and fatal.

After the death of SOCINUS, BELTHAZAR MEISNER, Doctor of Divinity, and Professor in the University of *Wittemberg*, animadverted upon this treatise, apprehending it was levelled against the LUTHERANS, to which persuasion he belonged; as he did not know that, by the term EVANGELIC, as used in *Lithuania* and *Poland*, no others were meant than those who were elsewhere called CALVINISTS, by way of distinction from the LUTHERANS. This writer handled the subject with great learning, judgment, and good temper. He was answered by JONAS SCHLICHTINGIUS, who illustrated

illustrated and defended the sentiments and reasonings of SOCINUS, in three volumes 12mo. published in the years 1635, 36, and 37*.

For the use of a certain *German Nobleman*, who came from *Paris* to *Poland* for the sake of investigating evangelical Truth, and of others, devoted to sacred enquiries, at *Racow*, he drew up, a year before his death, a *Commentary upon the first Epistle of JOHN*, but never revised it. VALENTINUS SMALCIUS, an UNITARIAN Pastor at *Racow*, published it in the year 1614, 8vo. with a dedication to the senators of *Argentoratum*, now called *Strasburg*. The Editor observes that from the polemical works of SOCINUS, many of which had been published, the penetration of his genius and his learning might be discerned; and adds, that, from this performance, which was chiefly didactic, it might be seen how great a portion of his gifts God had bestowed on this man†.

In 1609 VALENTINUS SMALCIUS printed at *Racow*, in 4to, and inscribed with a prefatory Dedication to the University at *Heidelberg*, *Theological*
 Z 2 *Lectures,*

* *Quæstio*: Num ad regnum DEI possidendum necesse sit in nullo peccato EVANGELICÆ doctrinæ adverso manere? contra BALTHASAREM MEISNERUM disputata. Præfatio ad lectorem.

† Opera SOCINI, Vol. i. p. 156.

Lectures, by SOCINUS. There were two editions of this work in *Dutch*.

In 1611 were printed in 8vo. various Tracts on the Church; in which are contained, 1. A Piece to shew, that the Popes cannot defend their Doctrines and Rites by Authority of the Church; and that the question, What is the Church, and among whom is it to be found? is not necessary. 2. A brief Demonstration of the Unreasonableness of disputing the Authority of the Ministers called EVANGELIC. 3. Doubts on the Question relative to the Church. 4. The Answer of SOCINUS to those Doubts. 5. An Explanation of *Matt. xvi. 18*. 6. Some Remarks on this Subject collected from the writings of SOCINUS. 7. A Remonstrance against those who do not enquire for themselves into the Subjects relative to eternal Salvation. 8. Some Observations collected from some Letters of SOCINUS on the Church and the Invocation of CHRIST. These Tracts were printed in *Dutch*, 4to. 1639,

Miscellanies, i. e. *Theological* Pieces or Tracts, on different subjects, were printed at *Racow*, 1611, 8vo. But they were such as we have mentioned before. In the same year was printed a Tract concerning GOD, CHRIST, and the Holy Spirit, with some Theses to shew that CHRIST is not possessed of true Divinity, unless he be the Creator of Heaven and Earth;

Earth; with Answers. But this little piece had been published before.

Among the posthumous works of Socinus must be reckoned, An Explanation of the Sermon in the 5th, 6th, and 7th, Chapters of MATTHEW's Gospel, an unfinished work.

HIERONYMUS MOSCOROVIVS published at *Racow*, 1614, with a short Preface, Explanations and Paraphrases of different Passages of holy Scripture.

In 1618 the Epistles of Socinus to various Friends were printed; those of some Persons to him and his Answers; and four Epistles to DUDITH translated from *Italian* into *Latin*; 8vo. In these Epistles various religious questions are handled and many passages of Scripture explained. They were printed in 1666. The four Letters to DUDITH were printed separately at *Racow*, 1635.

We must not omit the mention of another treatise, entitled *Sacred Lectures*, in which the Authority of the Holy Scriptures is vindicated and supported. It is a valuable though not complete work, and bears in it strong marks of his critical, accurate and extensive enquiries. The apparent inconsistencies between the quotations from the Old and New Testament,

tament, the difficulties attending the application of the Prophecies from the former to Facts recorded in the latter, and the questions that arise from a comparative view of the *Genealogies* of MATTHEW and LUKE, are all impartially stated, distinctly and fully considered, and judiciously discussed. This work, as well as some other posthumous tracts, was not written by the pen of SOCINUS, but only dictated to an amanuensis, and never afterwards revised. It was printed at *Racow*, 1618, 8vo. The same was translated into *Dutch* and illustrated with notes by THOMAS CAMPHUYSIUS, an UNITARIAN Minister in *Holland*, 1666. 4to.

There were likewise published, after his death, sophistical Arguments explained, for the benefit of his friends, and illustrated by *theological* Examples: a work dictated but not written by him, neither revised nor finished: 1625, 8vo.

A very short Institution in the Christian Religion, by Way of Question and Answer, generally called a *Catechism*: the Author's death prevented his finishing it.

A short Introduction to the right Understanding of the Supper of the LORD: *Racow*, 1618, 8vo.

An

An Answer to a Letter of J. NIEMOJEVIUS to G. SCHOMANNUS, in which the former piece of SOCINUS is animadverted upon.

Some select Remarks from the Strictures of SOCINUS on a Book of NIEMOJEVIUS against IMMANUEL VIGA, on the subject of the Lord's Supper.

Propositions concerning the Character of CHRIST.

A short Discourse on the Method of Salvation, collected and formed from the Conversation of SOCINUS.

On the Agreement and Difference between the Old and New Testament.

A Fragment of a Treatise in which he intended to confute such as assert that JESUS CHRIST, the Son of God, is the one supreme God, or that he existed before he was born of the Virgin MARY.

The *Introduction* of a Piece in which he intended to answer the arguments produced to support the notion of three Persons in one divine Essence.

Strictures on the THESES of CLAUDIUS ALBERTIUS TRIUNCURIAN concerning the Trinity, written

for the use of N. N. Ambassador from *France* to the Princes of *Germany*.

SOCINUS left behind him, besides the above-mentioned works, some *Manuscripts* which were never published; and some pieces have been ascribed to him of which it is more probable he was not the Author.

In the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* the Works of SOCINUS are collected together, and form the two first volumes of that edition of the *Polish UNITARIAN* Authors. The whole set constitutes nine volumes, folio, and was printed at *Amsterdam*, 1668. The Tracts, &c. of SOCINUS stand in the following order.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

Explicatio MATT. cap. v. et partis vi. i. e. An Exposition of the fifth Chapter of MATTHEW and Part of the sixth.

Initii 1. cap. *Evang.* JOHANNIS: i. e. Exposition of the Beginning of the first Chapter of JOHN's Gospel.

In cap. septimum ad Rom. i. e. An Exposition of the seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*.

Defensio istius Explicationis: i. e. A Defence of that Explanation.

Variorum

Variorum S. Scripturæ locorum: i. e. An Exposition of various Passages of Scripture.

In Epistolam 1. JOHANNIS: i. e. A Commentary on the first Epistle of JOHN.

De Autoritate S. Scripturæ: i. e. On the Authority of the holy Scripture.

Lectiones sacræ: i. e. Sacred Lectures.

De Ecclesia varii Tractatus: i. e. Various Tracts concerning the Church.

Epistolæ ad Amicos: i. e. Epistles to Friends.

Prælectiones Theologicæ: i. e. Theological Lectures.

De Justificatione: i. e. On Justification.

Elenchi Sophistici: i. e. Sophistical Arguments.

Institutio Christianæ Religionis: i. e. Instructions in the Christian Religion.

Quod Homines Regni Poloniæ, &c. i. e. The Duty of those called EVANGELIC to join the Assemblies of the UNITARIANS.

De Baptismo: i. e. On Baptism.

De Cæna Domini: i. e. On the Lord's Supper.

De DEO, CHRISTO, Spiritu Sancto: i. e. On GOD, CHRIST, and the Holy Spirit.

Fragmenta duorum scriptorum: i. e. Fragments of two Pieces.

VOLUME THE SECOND contains

Contra PALÆOLOGUM de Magistratu: i. e. A Treatise on Magistracy against PALÆOLOGUS.

De

De CHRISTO Servatore, contra COVETUM: i. e.
A Treatise concerning the Saviour, against COVETUS.

De statu primi hominis ante lapsum: i. e. A Discourse on the State of the first Man before the Fall.

De natura CHRISTI: i. e. A Treatise on the Nature of CHRIST.

Contra assertiones theologicas collegii Posnaniensis: i. e. Animadversions on the theological Assertions of the College of *Posnania*. *Miscellanea sacra.*

Contra ERASMUM JOHANNEM: i. e. A Disputation against ERASMUS JOHANNES.

Contra WUJEKUM: i. e. The same against WUJEKUS.

Breves tractatus: i. e. Short Tracts.

Contra EUTROPIUM: i. e. A Disputation against EUTROPIUS.

Contra CHRISTIANUM FRANKEN: i. e. The same against CHRISTIAN FRANKEN.

Contra FRANCISCUM DAVIDEM: i. e. The same against FRANCIS DAVID.

Many of these Treatises and Discourses of SOCI-NUS were drawn up in submission to the necessity he was under of giving a more full and impartial representation of the religious debates in which he was engaged: many were extorted from him by the importunities of his friends and the confidence the UNITARIAN Churches reposed in him. He often
modestly

modestly urged these pleas in excuse for his publications.

A quotation or two will shew in what high estimation his works have been held by some, and will assist the reader to judge what method of argumentation, what peculiar excellencies of writing, he may expect to find in them.

The pious and good Mr. BIDDLE observes, “ that
 “ he shewed the world a more accurate way to dis-
 “ cuss controversies in religion and to fetch out the
 “ very marrow of the holy Scripture, so that a
 “ man may more avail himself by reading his works
 “ than perhaps by perusing all the fathers, together
 “ with the writings of more modern authors.”

And he gives us from another author (BODECHERUS) the following eulogium on the writings of SOCINUS. “ The Truth is to be acknowledged
 “ every where: for neither doth she receive her
 “ value from any person, but gives it to him. Nor
 “ can we in this place forbear to give this testimony
 “ unto SOCINUS where he agreeth with the *ortho-*
 “ *dox*; let the Christian world hear if it please.
 “ He disputeth with the thrust; granteth to the ad-
 “ versary whatsoever he may, without prejudice to
 “ the truth and his cause; where the adversary is
 “ to

“ to be pressed, there he maketh a stand, and ar-
 “ gueth to the conscience; contendeth rather
 “ with Scripture; and with reason, not with preju-
 “ dices, as the school of CALVIN is for the most
 “ part wont to do; he sheltereth not himself amidst
 “ certain nice captions; he seeketh not starting-
 “ holes, but hits the very throat of the cause. In
 “ him ATHEISTS, JEWS, GENTILES, PAPISTS, find
 “ matter of employment otherwise than in the wri-
 “ tings of the CALVINISTS*.”

We will conclude with the encomium bestowed
 by his *Polish* biographer on the works of SOCINUS.
 “ The reader (says he) will find in his writings those
 “ engines destroyed by which the hope of happi-
 “ ness to which we aspire and the glory of the most
 “ high GOD are subverted. He will find the ho-
 “ nour of our religion supported, and its reputation
 “ vindicated and asserted from those absurd and
 “ shocking opinions on account of which it hath
 “ been most injuriously traduced by strangers to
 “ it. Lastly, he will find all the impediments re-
 “ moved by which men, disgusted with the piety
 “ required

* The Life of that incomparable Man FAUSTUS SO-
 CINUS, 1653. Preface, p. 2. and p. 63, 64, of the
 work itself,

“ required of us, have obstructed the hope and
 “ acquisition of the heavenly inheritance*.”

THE CONCLUSION.

WE have now finished our review of the character and sentiments of SocINUS. His sentiments ought not to be hastily adopted nor rashly rejected, upon the short acquaintance with them the reader can have formed from the preceding pages. In questions of moment our enquiries should be conducted with deliberation, diligence and caution; no names, how great or venerable soever, should determine our judgment; and our creed should be the submission of the soul to reason, argument and Scripture.

But, with respect to the life and character of SocINUS, we may be allowed to be more speedy in passing sentence upon them. When a moral and religious character is exhibited to our view, the appeal is made to our sense of good and evil, and there is no room for long consideration and a chain of reasoning to determine whether it be amiable or not, whether it merit imitation or not.

The reader, as he has gone along with us, has formed in his own mind a judgment of SocINUS: he

* SocIN. Opera. *Dissertatio de hisce operibus*, p. 8.

he has seen that, like other men, he had some failings; but I flatter myself, whatever prejudices he had imbibed against him, he has been so ingenuous as to own, this man had great virtues. The *Polish* biographer indeed concludes his account of him with expressing his apprehensions that posterity perhaps, instead of paying no honours to the name of SOCINUS, would hold it in too high veneration.

Many persons, however, without carrying their good opinion of SOCINUS to an extravagant height, will be disposed to fall in with the representation of his merit by a valuable writer. “ High, most deservedly high, as those great Reformers stand, LUTHER, ZUINGLIUS, and CALVIN, in the book of fame, FAUSTUS SOCINUS will be found to rank as high in the book of life, which is of more consequence; who, for the sake of CHRIST and his Gospel, left his whole family, fortune, and expectancies, in Italy, and lived a stranger upon earth, in a strange country, irreproachable in his morals, indefatigable in his labours for the cause of God’s revealed truth, and persecuted to the last*.”

Indeed, if I mistake not, these memoirs will serve to convince us with what precipitancy men
form

* Theological Repository, Vol. i. p. 106, 107.

form their judgment of others, before they have been made acquainted with their history. This has been remarkably the case with respect to SocINUS. It has not been supposed that any good qualities or amiable virtues could be found in the life of a man whose sentiments have been deemed so erroneous. The prejudices men have conceived against his sentiments have extended themselves to his name and character. Now, though the author of this work be not at all solicitous that the character of SocINUS should be thought of more favourably than it deserves, yet he will think he has not laboured in vain, if the preceding pages cause it to be regarded with more esteem than it has yet met with; because he thinks justice will thereby be done to merit, and that candour will be exercised and improved, which is one of the most lovely and important dispositions the reader can cultivate. Besides, he who finds, as in this instance, that he has entertained hasty and rash sentiments of another, will be inclined for the future to suspect the truth of those judgments of men and things which arise from prejudice and popular representations, and to suspend at least his opinion till he has an opportunity to examine and try, and be furnished with grounds on which to form a righteous judgment,

But

But desirable as it is to promote a candid temper, this is only one object proposed by the present work: the author aims to serve by it the cause of Religion, and to awaken the expiring spirit of true Christian zeal. It appears that the interests of Religion and Truth were dear to SocINUS; his life was devoted to them; and I cannot but express my chearful hopes, my ardent wishes, that his example may be in this view useful to my readers, and may excite them to emulate his faith and zeal as far as their respective abilities, stations and circumstances in life, will admit.

“ The knowledge of divine things, as SocINUS
 “ himself argues, and the investigation of the divine
 “ will on points of faith and practice, or the study
 “ of Christianity, possesseth two excellencies which
 “ give it a superiority and entitle it to the preference
 “ above all other sciences.

“ The one is, that the subject and end of it are
 “ of the noblest kind, and far surpasses whatever is
 “ proposed or treated of in any other science. The
 “ subject of it is God himself and the revelation of
 “ his will: the end of it is our duty towards God,
 “ the advancement of his glory, and our eternal
 “ salvation and felicity. As to the subject of reli-
 “ gious investigation, which is the divine Being,
 “ none

“ none will venture to doubt, but in dignity and
 “ excellence he infinitely surpasseth all the objects
 “ which the human mind can contemplate: and as
 “ to the end of this knowledge, our duty towards
 “ God and our eternal happiness, it is folly to dis-
 “ pute its superiority to every thing that can be
 “ conceived.

“ The other thing which gives religious know-
 “ ledge the advantage above all other sciences is,
 “ that all other speculations and enquiries, except
 “ the mathematics, which are not properly scien-
 “ ces but arts, as they are commonly called, have
 “ no peculiar certain principles on which they de-
 “ pend, and from which the mind can, without any
 “ difficulty, advance to a complete knowledge of
 “ them, and which render it easy to treat of them
 “ with propriety and accuracy; or, if the sciences
 “ have any peculiar and certain principles, they
 “ are so few that disputation seldom leads to the
 “ discovery of them. But the knowledge and in-
 “ vestigation of sacred truth has many fundamental
 “ principles, and they are clear and evident, and
 “ enable us both to conduct our enquiries and to
 “ attain an acquaintance with divine things.

“ Nay, this divine science is expressly laid down
 “ and explained, as far as relates to the end we have

A a “ mentioned,

“ mentioned. Since God, in his wonderful and
 “ gracious providence, has given and preserved to
 “ us the written monuments of those holy men who,
 “ at the impulse and inspiration of the divine spirit,
 “ or being full of the Holy Ghost, committed these
 “ principles of truth to writing; these books we
 “ call the Bible, or the Old and New Testament.
 “ The knowledge of divine things, especially of the
 “ Christian religion which we embrace, and of the
 “ sanctity of which we entertain no doubt, is con-
 “ tained in these books*.”

On these principles, on a deep conviction of the
 superior excellence and importance of religious
 knowledge, SOCINUS himself acted, and devoted
 his life to the study of divine truth, and to the pro-
 pagation of what appeared to him just and scriptural
 sentiments in religion. For this purpose he left his
 country, family and estate: for this purpose he
 filled up his time with diligent and assiduous labours:
 for this purpose he sustained reproach, poverty and
 sufferings.

And will any one condemn his conduct as wild
 and extravagant? Will any one say he carried
 his regards to divine truth to too high a pitch? To
 understand

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 287. col. 1.

understand the scheme which has for its object the chief happiness of man, which points out to us a future and eternal existence, is the concern of every man: to free this scheme from those human additions with which it has been encumbered, from the errors which have been blended with it, and from the superstitions that have enervated its noble spirit and defaced its beauties, is the duty of every Christian; for to every Christian God hath in some measure committed his holy religion to be protected and guarded.

This scheme has every signature of dignity and importance stamped upon it. It was not communicated to the world till after it had been introduced with a long apparatus of prophecies; and to impart it to mankind cost the Redeemer all the labours of his most useful life, all the pains and ignominy of his Cross. He was raised from the dead and exalted to universal dominion to bear witness to the truth: to bring men to embrace it there was an uncommon exhibition of miraculous gifts and powers: thousands and ten thousands, polite cities and distant kingdoms, enlisted under its banner: the face of the intellectual and moral world was changed, as far as religious knowledge was concerned; all things wore a new aspect; a new creation took place here below; and, above, angels, principalities and pow-

ers, were made subject to CHRIST. Can these things fail to point out our duty? Ought not our zeal, regulated by candour and benevolence, to be exerted in the same cause? And let them judge, how far they acquit themselves of the obligations they are under to preserve the revealed will of God pure and uncorrupt, who either do not enquire into its sacred contents, or who are satisfied with entertaining just and liberal sentiments in their own breasts, without using any effort to diffuse such sentiments in the world, and perhaps, as far as their religious conduct extends, countenance what they really deem to be error and superstition.

The truth cannot enlighten the world, it cannot be spread amongst men, if it be concealed in the bosoms of those who hold it.

They, who worship in forms and with rites their own consciences disapprove, cannot worship in sincerity and truth; and it cannot be said of them as of the redeemed from the world, who are to sing the song of the Lamb, that in their mouths there was no guile. And how can such worship be acceptable to the God of righteousness and truth? If all comply with falsehood and error or appear to comply, if men take no measures to promote rational religion, this cause is deserted, and superstition is left

to prevail and gain ground with little or no opposition.

It is remarkable that the Jews, in their afflicted state of captivity, were enjoined to be witnesses for God and truth. As far as they could contribute to the propagation of true religion by the worship of one living God, by the frank profession of their faith in him, and by protesting against idolatry, they were commanded to do it; in nothing terrified by the power of their conquerors, in nothing discouraged by their own mean and oppressed lot. See JEREMIAH chap. xii.

The peculiar excellence and perfection of the Christian religion more especially binds us to maintain the like attention to its interest, and to exert our efforts in advancing its purity and power. The impartial study of the Scriptures, the regular worship of the Almighty on a rational plan, and in a manner as conformable as possible to the simplicity of the Gospel, and uniting our endeavours with those who are sincerely engaged in promoting scriptural knowledge and enquiries, are the most effectual means of approving ourselves the advocates of primitive Christianity: and how those Christians, who are prevailingly indifferent and remiss here, will answer for their coldness and languor another

day to their divine Lawgiver and Judge, how they will vindicate their fidelity and their love to him, it is not for me to say; but I should esteem it a great happiness, if what has been offered could awaken their attention, and lead them seriously to think how they will be able to justify their conduct to HIM who for this great end came into the world and died, to bear witness to the Truth. And if the example of SOCINUS serve to excite a rational and well-regulated zeal, and to call forth our resolute and active efforts in the cause of Religion, I shall think these memoirs of him have answered a valuable purpose, and shall rejoice in the success of my undertaking.

A P P E N D I X. I.

SocINUS's Exposition of some contro- verted TEXTS.

THE quotations from SocINUS in ch. 2. sect. 2. it is presumed, afford a faithful view of his sentiments on different controverted points, and furnish a general idea of his religious system. But yet I think, in justice to his critical abilities and to his memory as a theologist, it is necessary to lay before the Reader some specimens of his manner of investigating the sense of Scripture, and reconciling his notions to, or rather deriving them from, those passages of holy writ which have been supposed inconsistent with, and contradictory to, his scheme of principles. I will begin with his explication of the first chapter of JOHN's Gospel.

No. 1. SOCINUS's Exposition of some Verses in the
first Chapter of JOHN's Gospel.

In the Beginning was the Word.

“ THE error of those who suppose that by these
“ words, *in the beginning*, is pointed out the eternity
“ of CHRIST, is proved by this simple confide-
“ ration, that their opinion is not supported by any
“ authority of the Old or New Testament. For you
“ you will never find any place in the sacred wri-
“ ting where the *beginning* means eternity: there-
“ fore we say that the terms, *in the beginning*, do
“ not relate to eternity, but to the order of those
“ things which JOHN was about to write concern-
“ ing JESUS CHRIST, the best-beloved Son of GOD;
“ imitating herein MOSES, who in writing his His-
“ tory opens his Introduction with this word *Be-*
“ *ginning*. And it is truly surprizing that, when
“ almost all divines of every country grant that no
“ better or safer method of interpretation can be
“ found than to explain Scripture by Scripture,
“ yet, in this passage, forgetting themselves and
“ leaving the authority of the sacred Scriptures,
“ they indulge to their own fancies,

“ As therefore MOSES, when about to describe
“ the creation of the old world, said, in the *begin-*
“ *ning*,

“ *ning*, in reference to the transactions which he was
 “ about to record; as if he had said, at first, and
 “ before all things, God made the heaven and the
 “ earth; which event, thus concisely expressed, he
 “ then describes: so JOHN also, writing concern-
 “ ing the spiritual creation of the world by CHRIST,
 “ used this term, as expressive of method and or-
 “ der, but not of *eternity*; to teach us to conceive
 “ of the word as existing not from all eternity, but
 “ before all the created parts of this new world;
 “ and he designed to comprehend in a few words
 “ what he afterwards would more largely relate.
 “ And as MOSES’s design was not to discourse about
 “ the beginning of the universe, but only about the
 “ beginning of this world, and of the visible not
 “ invisible creation, he must be understood only of
 “ the former. So JOHN, when he said, in the *be-*
 “ *ginning*, referred to the beginning of those things
 “ about which he was discoursing, but not of all
 “ things that had existed long before.

“ Farther, the explanations given by interpreters
 “ of this term, *the word*, vary. In this however
 “ they agree, that the word means the eternal Son
 “ of GOD without all beginning; in as much as he
 “ was begotten before all ages, and (to use their
 “ language) was co-eternal, consubstantial and in
 “ every respect equal to his Father, and the second
 “ person

“ person in the Trinity. This and some other
 “ things of the kind, to which the *Greek* word
 “ λογος has given occasion, they have ingeniously,
 “ in their own opinion happily, imagined. All
 “ which things, as they are not only repugnant to
 “ the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testa-
 “ ment, but are self-contradictory and appear in a
 “ great measure ridiculous, have made (truly la-
 “ mentable it is) the sacred and most divine Reli-
 “ gion of JESUS CHRIST the great sport of JEWS
 “ and TURKS, and of all strangers to it.

“ What then means the phrase, *the word*? JOHN,
 “ by the term *the word*, means the man JESUS
 “ CHRIST, the Son of God, who, in the reign of
 “ AUGUSTUS, was born of the Virgin MARY, and
 “ whom he calls *the word*, not on account of his na-
 “ ture or substance, but because of the office he
 “ discharged when he revealed to us the word of
 “ the Gospel from his Father. For CHRIST would
 “ have profited us nothing, as to what concerns his
 “ nature and substance, unless he had unfolded
 “ the mystery of the Gospel.

“ It is to be further observed, that this is a phrase
 “ of JOHN's, (for JOHN has some peculiar phrases
 “ no other evangelist uses,) for you will never find
 “ in the sacred Scriptures that CHRIST was called
 “ the

“ *the word* except by JOHN himself; and his reason
 “ for speaking thus was no other than this, that by
 “ the means of CHRIST *the word* of the Gospel,
 “ which had been concealed, was revealed.

“ Here is in this language at once a *metaphor* and
 “ *metonymy*: the *metaphor* lies in this, that as, by
 “ the words of a man, his will is known, so by
 “ CHRIST all the will of GOD was laid open. For
 “ CHRIST spake to us, and first revealed to the
 “ human race the secret decrees of GOD concern-
 “ ing the redemption of man, having brought them
 “ from the bosom of his Father. JOHN i. 18.
 “ Hence the occasion for the use of a *metonymy*,
 “ since CHRIST is the author of *the word*, which
 “ by way of emphasis is entitled to that appellation,
 “ being more excellent and useful than all other
 “ words. Therefore as CHRIST one while me-
 “ taphorically calls himself a *vine*, a *shepherd* and a
 “ *door*, and then, using a *metonymy*, says he is the
 “ *truth*, the *life* and the *resurrection*, because he is
 “ the author and giver of those blessings; in like
 “ manner JOHN, in this passage and in Rev. xix. 13.
 “ (which place I wish to be consulted,) using at
 “ once a *metaphor* and *metonymy*, calls the man
 “ CHRIST JESUS *the word* of GOD. Which modes
 “ of expression abound both in sacred and profane
 “ writers.

“ But

“ But we see (to borrow examples for explaining
 “ this matter most suitable to the unlearned) that
 “ JOHN the Baptist is called in the sacred Scriptures
 “ a *voice*, which term certainly does not in any
 “ respect denote his substance or nature, but the
 “ office he discharged, when crying in the desert
 “ he invited men to repentance. AARON also was
 “ given to MOSES by the LORD for a mouth: and
 “ shall we say that this referred to the nature and
 “ substance of AARON? Or does it not clearly ap-
 “ pear to be understood of the office he was to dis-
 “ charge, of addressing PHARAOH and the people
 “ *Israel* in the room of MOSES? What wonder is
 “ it then if JESUS CHRIST, not on account of his
 “ nature and substance, but on account of the office
 “ he executed on earth as the Vicegerent of GOD,
 “ be called the *word of God* by our Evangelist, who
 “ greatly delights in these modes of expression?
 “ A person perhaps, without the charge of weak-
 “ ness, may think he more readily used this lan-
 “ guage because, discoursing on the new and spi-
 “ ritual creation of the world, he intended to call
 “ CHRIST JESUS, by whom it was created a-new,
 “ by the name of the instrument by which the old
 “ world was created. For we read that by the
 “ word of GOD the heaven, the earth, the sea, and
 “ whatsoever are in them, were made: and as by
 “ his word GOD at first gave to the animal creation
 “ bodily

“ bodily life and light, so, after man was fallen in-
 “ to death and eternal darkness, in his unspeakable
 “ mercy, by his own word he created the world
 “ again, and renewed and restored to men spiritual
 “ life and light.

“ But what chiefly contributes to explain this
 “ passage is, that all the names which we meet with,
 “ ascribed to CHRIST, are bestowed on him not on
 “ account of any divine and eternal nature and sub-
 “ stance, but only on account of his office and
 “ power, and the wonderful works performed by
 “ him. For JESUS CHRIST is called a *Master*, the
 “ *Light*, the *Way*, the *Truth*, the *Life*, a *Door*, a
 “ *Shepherd*, a *Vine*, *Bread*, a *Stone*, a *Lamb*, an *Ad-*
 “ *vocate*, a *Mediator*, a *Priest*, the *Resurrection*, our
 “ *Righteousness*, our *Hope*, and by many other
 “ names of this kind. As then those names do not
 “ denote his nature or substance, so neither has the
 “ term, *the Word*, by which name he is pointed out
 “ in this place, such a signification.

“ Here, by the way, is to be lamented the unskil-
 “ fulness, or rather the miserable shift of many,
 “ who, although almost nothing be said in the divine
 “ oracles concerning the abstruse nature or sub-
 “ stance of GOD or CHRIST, yet labour exceed-
 “ ingly, and wonderfully rack themselves in various
 “ ways,

“ ways, to discover many hidden things about the
 “ nature and substance of each and what they are :
 “ and whilst they thus apply themselves and endea-
 “ vour to teach it to others, good God! what
 “ have they not ventured to do ? What sophisms,
 “ what amazing comments, have they obtruded on
 “ the simple vulgar instead of the Gospel ! What
 “ dogmas not before heard of by the people of
 “ God, and certainly belonging more to PLA-
 “ TONISM than CHRISTIANITY, have they brought
 “ into the Church ! What large volumes have
 “ they written on these points ! By which, through
 “ the just judgment of God, they have involved
 “ themselves and the truth in darkness : for besides
 “ with the utmost propriety the passage in the
 “ *Proverbs*, ch. xxv. 27. *for men to search their own*
 “ *glory is not glory*, may be applied to them, which
 “ they have been oftener accustomed to throw out
 “ against those who reject their inventions ; they
 “ greatly err in this instance, that when the sacred
 “ Scriptures have most plainly spoken concerning
 “ the will of God and his promises by CHRIST, yet
 “ some of them more readily devote night and day
 “ to the study of the *Greek* philosophy than to the
 “ word of God, and either leave this part, on which
 “ the salvation of men depends, untouched, or have
 “ handled it as coldly and negligently as if treating
 “ on some indifferent thing.

“ But

“ But let us, not treading in their footsteps, lay
 “ aside all disputations concerning the essence of
 “ God as little conducive to piety, but as to what
 “ God hath commanded us to do and what he hath
 “ promised us, let us diligently study it; and, when
 “ we have discovered it, let us carefully regard and
 “ believe it as what will certainly be accomplished.

“ But to return to what we at first proposed, it
 “ is in brief this: JOHN, intending to write con-
 “ cerning our Lord JESUS CHRIST, the Son of
 “ God and the Redeemer of the world, and of the
 “ spiritual world created again by him, and of the
 “ material world restored in a spiritual manner by
 “ him, begins a little higher than with his manifes-
 “ tation, saying, *in the beginning was the word: i. e.*
 “ in the beginning of the Gospel, when JOHN the
 “ Baptist began to call the *Israelites* to repentance,
 “ and before he was made known to the *Jews* by
 “ the preaching of the Baptist, CHRIST, the son of
 “ God existed, and was ordained by God for this
 “ office of unfolding his will: for it is plain from
 “ MARK, ch. i. (whose authority as far as concerns
 “ the word *Beginning* our author uses) the begin-
 “ ning of the Gospel is to be reckoned from the
 “ preaching of the Baptist.

“ Therefore JESUS owned himself to be of
 “ *Jewish* extraction, was conversant, and that for
 “ thirty

“ thirty years, among the *Jews*, and was personally
 “ known to them, neither were they ignorant of his
 “ name, for we read, JOHN vi. 42. that he was in
 “ general called JESUS the son of JOSEPH. But
 “ that he was *the word* and the CHRIST, *i. e.* that
 “ God would by him publish his will to the world
 “ and redeem men from eternal death, this was a
 “ matter wholly unknown to all; and therefore
 “ JOHN subjoins

And the Word was with GOD.

“ That is, JESUS, as the word of God, before
 “ he was pointed out by the preaching of the
 “ Baptist, was known to GOD alone: hence, a lit-
 “ tle below, the Baptist says, *I baptize you with wa-*
 “ *ter, but there stands one in the midst of you whom*
 “ *you know not; he it is that shall come after me.*
 “ Nay, and the Baptist confesses he was ignorant
 “ who was the CHRIST, when he says, *And I knew*
 “ *him not, but that he should be manifest to Israel,*
 “ *therefore I came baptizing with water.* It is clear
 “ also that in the Scriptures the word *with* is used
 “ in this sense. For to this same purpose JOHN
 “ himself, in the first chapter of his first Epistle, the
 “ beginning of which throws the greatest light upon
 “ this passage, writes thus, *And we declare unto*
 “ *you eternal life, which was with the Father, and*
 “ was

“ *was manifested to us.* Which is as if he had said,
 “ we announce to you that eternal life which no
 “ man knew before this, since it was known to
 “ God only, who determined to grant it to us;
 “ but now it is revealed to all. For, by the preach-
 “ ing, by the miracles, by the death and resurrec-
 “ tion of the Son of God, who, ascending into
 “ heaven, hath bestowed upon us the richest gifts
 “ of the Holy-Spirit; and, lastly, by the divine
 “ preaching of the apostles, that eternal life and
 “ immortality which had been almost hid from
 “ mankind was published to the world.

“ But if you would rather refer the word *as* to the
 “ apostles and disciples only, who preached
 “ CHRIST to others, (which construction I greatly
 “ approve,) yet the sense of the term *with* will re-
 “ main the same, *i. e.* that the eternal life revealed
 “ to them was before known to God only. And
 “ so, before CHRIST manifested his own glory, it
 “ was not known what and how great a person he
 “ was. But he is then said properly to have ma-
 “ nifested his glory, when he began to work mira-
 “ cles. JOHN ii. But if any one will foolishly
 “ cavil, and say, that *not to manifest his own glory,*
 “ and *to be unknown* are different things: the Bap-
 “ tist will confute him, who says, *that he came that*
 “ JESUS might be manifested to Israel. By which
 B b “ words,

“ words, no only that weak objection is invalid-
 “ dated, but it is evident that JESUS, before the
 “ preaching of the Baptist, was unknown: so that,
 “ with as much propriety as it could be spoken of
 “ eternal life, CHRIST may be said to have been
 “ *with the Father.*

“ Besides, his brethren, when they persuade him
 “ to depart from Galilee and go to Judea, use these
 “ words: *No one does any thing in secret and seeks him-
 “ self to be open: if thou do these things manifest thy
 “ self TO THE WORLD.* You see, that to manifest
 “ himself to the world is nothing else but, by illuf-
 “ trious deeds, to display his own power that had
 “ been before concealed, and to procure a great
 “ name among men. Lastly, to shew that the
 “ phrase, *with God*, may be explained by this
 “ other, *with men*, it will be to the purpose to
 “ quote those words of LUKE, ch. ii. where he
 “ speaks of CHRIST; for in that passage we under-
 “ stand these phrases in a similar sense. *And JESUS,
 “ says he, increased in wisdom and in stature, and in
 “ favour with God and men; that is, as if he had
 “ said, in the sight of God and men.*

“ *And the Word was God.*
 “ This term, GOD, does not denote substance;
 “ or person, but authority, power and beneficence;
 “ and

“ and (as grammarians speak) is not a proper name
 “ but an appellative ; which I doubt not is well
 “ known to all who have the least acquaintance
 “ with language. But in the sacred books this
 “ name is καὶ ἑξοχην, emphatically, or, as some ex-
 “ press it, by an antonomasia, given as his proper
 “ name to the supreme Author of all things, as to
 “ the being who is the Lord and Judge of all, and
 “ the Fountain, Origin and Giver of every good
 “ gift. Yet sometimes it is bestowed on created
 “ beings, when they are advanced by him, the first
 “ Author of all things, to any office, honour and
 “ power. For on this ground angels and princes,
 “ and also judges, are called Gods. *Psal.* xcvi. 7.
 “ and lxxxii. 6. *Exod.* xxii. 28. So MOSES was
 “ constituted a God to PHARAOH, and was given
 “ instead of God to AARON. *Exod.* vii. 1. and
 “ iv. 16.

“ As this is the case, is it surprizing if CHRIST,
 “ the word of God, is said to be God, when he
 “ hath not only conferred on miserable men innu-
 “ merable benefits, and is the Guide, Author and
 “ Finisher of eternal life ; but is moreover ad-
 “ vanced by God above men and angels, above
 “ all principality and power, and is made Lord of
 “ heaven and earth, and judge of the living and
 “ dead ? But to assert that CHRIST is God in the

“ same sense as the supreme and most exalted Au-
 “ thor of all things, who made heaven and earth,
 “ betrays the greatest ignorance. For in the sa-
 “ cred scriptures the Father alone of JESUS
 “ CHRIST, the invifible and omnipotent JEHOVAH,
 “ is distinguished with this honour. Hence PAUL
 “ fays, *For although there be who are called Gods,*
 “ *whether in heaven or earth, as there are gods many*
 “ *and lords many, yet to us there is but one GOD, the*
 “ *Father, of whom are all things.* 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

“ Yet CHRIST is not to be lowered into the rank
 “ of angels and other men who have been honoured
 “ with the name GOD, becaufe he received from
 “ GOD far greater, and, as we have now fhewn,
 “ more excellent power, honour, glory and majesty,
 “ than any other man, or than all who have been
 “ called Gods, ever obtained, whether men or
 “ angels, fince he is made the head and prince
 “ over all. Nor did the author of the Epiftle to
 “ the *Hebrews* mean any thing elfe, when he com-
 “ pares CHRIST, the Son of GOD, with angels and
 “ with MOSES: from which comparifon it clearly
 “ appears that CHRIST, not lefs than MOSES and
 “ angels, referred every thing he poffeffed to GOD
 “ as received from him: Yet, as he faid, CHRIST
 “ *was made fo much better as he obtained a more excel-*
 “ *lent name than they.* Heb. i. 4. For the compari-
 “ fon

“ son would have failed had CHRIST derived all
 “ things he possessed from himself and not from
 “ GOD.

“ Now, that CHRIST had nothing besides what
 “ he possessed as man, is in my apprehension very
 “ plain. For he possessed nothing more distin-
 “ guished and excellent than a claim to the adora-
 “ tion of all men and even of angels; which, of all
 “ prerogatives, it is the least probable any should
 “ derive from the gift and munificence of another
 “ being; yet PAUL asserts that GOD gave this
 “ power to CHRIST as *man*: therefore, without
 “ doubt, he possessed all other inferior powers as
 “ *man*, and also received them from GOD. So
 “ the Apostle writes of CHRIST, when he said he
 “ was obedient to the Death of the Cross, which
 “ certainly is spoken of him as *man*: *Therefore*
 “ *GOD hath highly exalted him, and given him a*
 “ *name above every name, that at the name of JESUS*
 “ *every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and*
 “ *things in earth, and things under the earth.* What
 “ can be spoken more clear, what more plain, than
 “ this? Did not then the Being, who communi-
 “ cated the greater, impart also the inferior prero-
 “ gatives? If CHRIST received a claim to the
 “ adoration of men from GOD, why may we not
 “ say that the honour of being called GOD was at-

“ so communicated? And although what hath
 “ been advanced be sufficient and more than so for
 “ persons of an unprejudiced mind, to give them
 “ just views of the ground on which CHRIST is
 “ called GOD, yet I will add a few more remarks
 “ for the illustration of the matter.

“ When, according to the evangelist JOHN,
 “ CHRIST was charged by the *Jews* that he being a
 “ man made himself GOD, he answered, *Is it not*
 “ *written in your law, I said ye are Gods, unto whom*
 “ *the word of GOD came? and the Scripture cannot*
 “ *be broken. Say ye of him whom the Father hath*
 “ *sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest,*
 “ *because I said I am the Son of GOD?* JOHN X. 34,
 “ 35, 36. In these words CHRIST, so far from de-
 “ nying, asserts that he was GOD and the Son of
 “ GOD; but explains the true and principal ground
 “ of his Deity and (if I may be allowed the expres-
 “ sion) divine Sonship: and, because he was a
 “ man, he did not venture to claim any other De-
 “ ity or divine Sonship to himself than what was
 “ granted from GOD to him as man, by his being
 “ sanctified. And these words of CHRIST, if any
 “ one will carefully weigh what we have said in our
 “ exposition of that passage, will clearly prove,
 “ that CHRIST is therefore GOD, because he is our
 “ Benefactor, Prince, and Lord, all which things
 “ he

“ he ascribed to the gift of his Father. Thus PE-
 “ TER speaks : *Let all the house of Israel know assu-*
 “ *redly that GOD hath made that same JESUS whom*
 “ *ye have crucified, both Lord and CHRIST.* Acts
 “ ii. 36.

“ Therefore it is not surprising that PAUL calls
 “ the *Father of glory the GOD of our Lord JESUS*
 “ *CHRIST.* Eph. i. 17. Why ? Because CHRIST,
 “ the Teacher of Truth, hath declared the same
 “ thing with his own mouth : *I ascend to my Father*
 “ *and your Father, to my GOD and your GOD.* Why ?
 “ Because that, now exalted to the right-hand of
 “ GOD, he governs his Church, not as supreme
 “ Author and Lord, but as a Vicegerent. Besides,
 “ on the last day, when all things shall have been
 “ made subject to him, he will restore the kingdom
 “ to GOD his Father and be subject to him, that
 “ GOD *may be all in all.* To this let it be added,
 “ that CHRIST never taught that he was the one
 “ GOD, the Author of all things, but rather, in
 “ all his words and actions, always ascribed all the
 “ praise and honour to GOD his Father, as the
 “ source of his office, power and glory.

“ But if any one ask, when CHRIST received
 “ from GOD his Father those excellent gifts, on ac-
 “ count of which he is properly called GOD ; if the

“ enquiry be made with respect to his divine autho-
 “ rity to forgive sins here on earth, and his super-
 “ natural power over unclean spirits, the winds,
 “ the sea, storms, diseases and death, and to per-
 “ form the most extraordinary divine and unheard-
 “ of works; and with respect to his amazing know-
 “ ledge of all divine things, and perfect acquaint-
 “ ance with the secret will of God: all these
 “ endowments he received from the beginning, in
 “ the sense in which we have above explained this
 “ phrase. If we speak of the glory, honour and
 “ solemn approbation of his character, as Mediator
 “ or ambassador, this he received at his baptism and
 “ on the mount; but if we speak of his great power
 “ in heaven and earth, this was given at his Re-
 “ surrection, after the death of the cross. Thus you
 “ see on what ground CHRIST is GOD.”

Ver. 3. *All Things were made by him; and without
 him was not any Thing made that was made.*

“ This universal term, *all things*, is not to be
 “ taken in so extensive a sense as we see it generally
 “ done, to comprehend the first creation of the
 “ heaven and the earth: for JOHN, in this passage,
 “ is not speaking of the structure of the material
 “ world, of which MOSES had written a complete
 “ account, but of the creation of the spiritual world,
 “ which

“ which is formed not by material but spiritual
 “ means, *i. e.* by the word of the Gospel, by which
 “ men are renewed and created again in a spiritual
 “ way. The words, *all things*, therefore, are not to
 “ be taken literally, as applicable to the formation
 “ of the world, but ought to be accommodated to
 “ the publication and reception of the Gospel: as
 “ if JOHN had said, from the preaching of the
 “ Gospel of CHRIST do they derive their origin,
 “ and by the influence and power of CHRIST were
 “ effected all those new, spiritual and divine events,
 “ which are seen among us in the world. For in
 “ the time of JOHN’S writing his History of CHRIST,
 “ many of the *Gentiles* had been brought to the
 “ knowledge of him, and were turned from dark-
 “ nefs to the true light, and other amazing works
 “ were wrought by the ministry of the Apostles.

“ Every one knows that universal terms are ge-
 “ nerally to be accommodated to the subject on
 “ which the discourse turns, and, though simply
 “ expressed, are to be often necessarily restrained.
 “ Yet, to suit our reasoning to the unlettered, we
 “ will produce, out of many, one very apt instance
 “ of this, drawn from the sacred Scriptures. You
 “ will find it in the words of PAUL, 2 Cor. v. 17.

“ If

“ *If any man be in CHRIST he is a new creature;*
 “ *old things are passed away; behold, all things are be-*
 “ *come new.* What do I hear? Are indeed all
 “ things become new? Are the heaven, the earth,
 “ the sea, trees and animals, renewed? No in-
 “ deed: every one is sensible that none of these
 “ things have, by the coming of CHRIST, changed
 “ their old nature, substance or qualities; nor doth
 “ the Apostle speak of them, but of those things
 “ that relate to Religion, the worship of GOD, his
 “ covenant and promises, and our manners and
 “ life, and he properly says all these things *were*
 “ *become new.* Just so our Evangelist hath said
 “ *that all things were made by CHRIST: i. e.* not the
 “ heaven and the earth, and all things before cre-
 “ ated; for what had this to do with his purpose?
 “ but he asserts all these things were created by
 “ CHRIST of which he had designed to write, and
 “ whatever he might omit that was connected with
 “ his present subject, such as the conversion of the
 “ *Gentiles*, and many works of CHRIST that we
 “ know he designedly passed by. JOHN XX. 30.
 “ xxi. 25. All these things were made by CHRIST,
 “ and without him was nothing made that was
 “ made, that related to this formation of things.
 “ For, as he said to his Apostles, *without me ye can*
 “ *do nothing.* JOHN XV. 5. Which passage is an
 “ elegant explanation of that before us.

Ver.

Ver. 4. *In him was Life.*

“ This must not be understood of the natural life
 “ of animals that resides in GOD, of which philo-
 “ sophers have discoursed with much subtilty, but
 “ of that eternal and immortal life which men ob-
 “ tain through CHRIST, to reveal which CHRIST
 “ was born and JOHN wrote his Gospel. But a
 “ passage must be quoted from this writer that
 “ plainly elucidates the words before us; as he
 “ hath elsewhere thus expressed himself: GOD
 “ *hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.*
 “ 1 JOHN V. 11. You see what life he said was in
 “ CHRIST. But eternal life is said to be in CHRIST
 “ on two accounts: first, as whoever believeth in
 “ him shall undoubtedly obtain eternal life: se-
 “ condly, because, at the last day, he will restore to
 “ life and render immortal all who have walked in
 “ his steps, and obeyed not the flesh but the spirit.

“ And that no one may think that this is the na-
 “ tural prerogative of CHRIST, so not in the least
 “ to regard it as communicated from GOD, let us
 “ hear CHRIST himself: *Verily, verily, I say unto*
 “ *you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead*
 “ *shall hear the voice of the Son of GOD; and they that*
 “ *hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in him-*
 “ *self, so hath he given to the Son to have life in him-*
 “ *self.*

“ *self*. JOHN v. 25, 26. From which words it most
 “ plainly appears, both that CHRIST received this
 “ power from GOD, *viz.* to have life in himself, and
 “ in what sense it may be asserted that they who
 “ hear him shall obtain life. Therefore the word
 “ *was* is not to be referred to the eternal ages that
 “ preceded the beginning of all created things, nor
 “ to the time previous to his being born of the Vir-
 “ gin, but to the period of CHRIST’s life amongst
 “ men. For the design of JOHN was to write the
 “ life of CHRIST when he accomplished all the
 “ measures requisite to our salvation. Nor should
 “ the word be taken in any other sense than it bears,
 “ when it is soon after said of the Baptist, *He was*
 “ *not that light.*

Ver. 10. *He was in the World, and the World was
 made by him, and the World knew him not.*

“ It cannot admit a doubt that here the world is
 “ to be understood, by a *metonymy*, for the men of
 “ the world; for this evidently appears when he
 “ adds, *the world knew him not.* For no one will
 “ deny that this is said only of men. But nobody
 “ that I know has yet rightly explained the mean-
 “ ing of JOHN in this passage. Therefore we will
 “ endeavour to investigate the true sense of his
 “ words, and clearly to prove that which we have
 “ hinted

“ hinted above. Every one knoweth that the New
 “ Testament, *i. e.* the writings of the Evangelists
 “ and Apostles, abound with an almost infinite
 “ number of *Hebraisms*. The *Hebrews* had no com-
 “ pounded words, and therefore used simple for
 “ compounded terms. Such an *Hebraism* some
 “ antients and moderns have acknowledged occurs
 “ in the Epistle to the *Ephesians* iii. 9. *who created*
 “ *all things by JESUS CHRIST*: which words they
 “ have, with justice and learning, interpreted, he
 “ renovated all things, or formed them *again*, by
 “ CHRIST JESUS. You have a like passage in the
 “ same Epistle: *We are his workmanship, created in*
 “ CHRIST JESUS *unto good works*: ch. ii. 10. Where
 “ every person sees and confesses, that not our first
 “ creation but our re-creation, (if I may so speak,)
 “ *i. e.* our new creation effected by CHRIST, is the
 “ subject of the discourse. As this is the case, the
 “ intention of our Evangelist is hereby explained;
 “ for he says that CHRIST *was in the world, i. e.*
 “ conversed amongst men, and the *world was made*
 “ *by him, i. e.* men were in some manner formed
 “ and created again. For by his means the carnal
 “ worship which the people of *Israel* had paid to
 “ GOD was abolished, and all idols that gave an-
 “ swers to the *Gentiles* were removed: besides, out
 “ of *Jews* and *Gentiles* one people of GOD was
 “ formed, and each were translated from darkness
 “ and

“ and death into light and immortality, and in one
 “ word, to use the language of the Apostle, before
 “ explained by us, *by him old things passed away and*
 “ *all things became new.* And yet, when CHRIST
 “ did this, and conferred so many benefits on men,
 “ he was not known by them, but was crucified by
 “ the *Jews* with the consent of the *Roman* magis-
 “ trate, and was afterwards severely persecuted in
 “ his members, both by *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and daily
 “ given up to the most cruel death.

“ Besides, might not CHRIST be said to have
 “ made the world, when he saved it in its ruinous
 “ state, gave his own flesh for the life of the world,
 “ and was the bread that giveth life to the world?
 “ Does not he who gives life make and create a
 “ thing? Is not this effect produced in a much
 “ more excellent and efficacious manner by the
 “ grant of an eternal than a frail life? And if the
 “ world then existing be said to have perished when
 “ wicked men perished in the waters of the flood,
 “ why may not the world, in turn, be said to be
 “ made by JESUS CHRIST, who bestows life on
 “ men, and redeems the human race from eternal
 “ death.

“ But to shew that this passage is not to be ex-
 “ plained of the first creation of the world or of
 “ mankind,

“ mankind, besides what hath been already said,
 “ I will produce this most cogent argument, espec-
 “ ally against those who suppose that the heaven and
 “ the earth, and all things contained in them, were
 “ made by CHRIST, not as an instrument employed
 “ by GOD, (the matter being already produced,
 “ and the work being far beneath the power and
 “ dignity of GOD,) but as the true and supreme
 “ Author of all things. For although this opinion
 “ be very far from the truth, yet our design is to
 “ impugn the more modern notion, although what
 “ we shall offer, if any one will carefully attend,
 “ will appear sufficient to refute each sentiment.
 “ It is very certain that these words, *and the world*
 “ *was made by him, and the world knew him not, i. e.*
 “ these two clauses unite into one sentence and
 “ have a mutual connection together; if the word
 “ *world* vary not its meaning, which we now take
 “ for granted*. For then it is as if it had been
 “ said, though *the world was made by him, yet the*
 “ *world did not know him.*
 “ Therefore it is plain the Evangelist is not
 “ speaking indiscriminately of any knowledge of
 “ him,

* According to another copy of the Original, this
 sentence must stand thus: “ Suppose it true that the
 “ word *world*, repeated by JOHN three times in this
 “ verse, is always to be taken in the same sense in which
 “ it was taken a little above, where we explained it.”

“ him, but only of that knowledge which refers to
 “ this point, *viz.* that *he made the world.* JOHN
 “ complains, or rather reproaches the world, that
 “ though it were made by CHRIST, yet it did not
 “ own him to be its former and maker, nor pay him
 “ the honour due to its Creator. But if this be
 “ understood of the first creation, it is as if JOHN
 “ had said, Oh! the perverseness and wickedness
 “ of the world! CHRIST created the heaven, the
 “ earth, the sea, and all things that are in them,
 “ and yet almost all men regarded him as created,
 “ and did not reverence him as the eternal GOD.
 “ Or by CHRIST all men were at first created, and
 “ yet they knew not that this natural life was ob-
 “ tained through him. Who sees not how remote
 “ this is from the design of our Evangelist? and
 “ that, if JOHN had meant this, all men might pro-
 “ perly reply to him, Why should we acknowledge
 “ that CHRIST is the maker of the earth, when no
 “ one, nor CHRIST himself, hath said this concern-
 “ ing himself? When he called the Being who cre-
 “ ated all things his Father and GOD? When he
 “ always ascribed to him all glory and honour?
 “ When he openly confessed himself inferior to
 “ him? Why do you blame us, who are rather to
 “ be blamed yourself, for ascribing to CHRIST
 “ those things which he (most devoted to the glory
 “ of his Father) never admitted a thought of ascri-
 “ bing to himself?

“ Indeed,

“ Indeed, I do not see how the Apostle JOHN
 “ could have obviated these objections, unless he
 “ had acknowledged himself to be the author of a
 “ new and unheard of dogma, about which the
 “ other Evangelists had not said a word. But ob-
 “ serve what a true coherence there is, if these
 “ words be understood of the second creation and
 “ renovation of the world. For so JOHN will with
 “ justice accuse the world, because it did not
 “ acknowledge its Saviour and Redeemer, when
 “ CHRIST himself not only openly proved, but actu-
 “ ally executed this office, by the plainest decla-
 “ rations, by the most conspicuous and astonishing
 “ miracles, by a most innocent life, by a most
 “ cruel death, and, lastly, by a most glorious re-
 “ surrection: for JOHN insisted much upon this, to
 “ shew that CHRIST, though he enlightened and
 “ renewed the world, was not known by men. For
 “ as above he said, *The light shined in the darkness,*
 “ *and the darkness comprehended it not:* and he here
 “ subjoins, *he came to his own, and his own received*
 “ *him not.*

Ver. 14. *And the Word was made Flesh.*

“ The Greek is και ο λογος σαρξ ἐγένετο. Every
 “ person, who has the least acquaintance with
 “ the Greek language, knows that these words

“ may be as well and properly rendered *and the word*
 “ *was flesh*, as that *the word was made flesh*. Unless we
 “ thought this too plain to need any proof, we could
 “ produce almost innumerable places of the New
 “ Testament by which it might be confirmed; but
 “ we apprehend this labour may be wayed as vain and
 “ useless: yet we will quote one place, which seems
 “ to us so apposite to this point, that it ought not
 “ to be passed over in silence. It is in LUKE, xxiv.
 “ 19. For thus one of the disciples, going to *Em-*
 “ *maus*, speaks of JESUS of Nazareth: *ὅς ἐγένετο*
 “ *ἀνὴρ προφήτης, δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ, καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τῷ Θεῷ*
 “ *καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ; i. e.* as our translation renders it,
 “ *who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before*
 “ *GOD and all the people.* Where it is clear the
 “ verb *ἐγένετο* must necessarily be explained *was*, not
 “ *was made*. Therefore in this passage we ought
 “ not to translate the verb *was made flesh*, but *was*
 “ *flesh*. For it has been sufficiently proved above
 “ that, by the term *the word*, must be understood
 “ the man who was born of the Virgin MARY, who
 “ could not be *made* flesh, but *was* flesh.

“ For two principal reasons JOHN adds this to
 “ what he said before. First, he inserts this clause
 “ lest if any one who should have read what he had
 “ written above of CHRIST, namely, that he was
 “ GOD, and the Word, by whom all things were
 “ made;

“ made; or from what he met with in the writings
 “ of others concerning CHRIST, or from what he
 “ might learn from general fame or had himself
 “ seen, that CHRIST was a man of low rank, hated
 “ by the priests and elders of the people of *Israel*,
 “ from whose violence his life was not secure; he
 “ inserts this clause, I say, lest any one, at the first
 “ appearance, should be offended, either supposing
 “ that JOHN wrote on another subject, or intended
 “ to deceive and impose on mankind, or that what
 “ others had asserted concerning CHRIST was not
 “ true: so that if he were about to take on himself
 “ the profession of the Christian name, or were en-
 “ quiring into the nature of this religion, imagining
 “ that these things were absurd, he would entertain
 “ suspicions of the falsehood of the Christian reli-
 “ gion, and entirely lay aside the profession of it.

“ Therefore our Evangelist, after he had ex-
 “ tolled CHRIST in such high strains, plainly owns
 “ that *he was flesh; i. e.* a poor afflicted despised
 “ man, in low circumstances, treated with con-
 “ tempt, and equally with others obnoxious to
 “ death. For it is very clear that by the word *flesh*,
 “ in the sacred Scriptures, is meant a man in a
 “ mean and afflicted state. Hence those words of
 “ the Psalmist, *Psal. lxxviii. 39. For he remembered*
 “ *that they were but flesh.* So in ISAIAH, ch. xl. 6.

“ *All flesh is grass ; and all the goodliness thereof as*
 “ *the flower of the field.* Hence that passage in JE-
 “ REMIAH, ch. xvii. 5. *Cursed be man that trusteth*
 “ *in man and maketh flesh his arm.* By this means
 “ the power and glory of GOD were more illuf-
 “ triously displayed, who, by JESUS CHRIST, not-
 “ withstanding *he was flesh, i. e.* an afflicted and
 “ despised man, performed so many amazing works,
 “ and effected those things JOHN related above.
 “ As PAUL says, we have this treasure, *viz.* the
 “ Gospel in earthly vessels, *that the excellency of the*
 “ *power may be of GOD, not of us.* 2 Cor. iv. 7. He
 “ speaks in the same manner also of CHRIST, 2 Cor.
 “ xiii. 4. *that he was crucified through weakness, yet*
 “ *lived by the power of GOD.* All these things are
 “ very useful to us : for when we see that CHRIST,
 “ notwithstanding he was a poor and despised man,
 “ and delivered up as a malefactor, by the princes
 “ of this world, to a most shameful death, yet after-
 “ ward was raised by the power of GOD to an
 “ immortal existence, and advanced to the highest
 “ glory, our hope is animated that we also, if we
 “ suffer together with him, shall obtain like glory
 “ from GOD our Father, though we have been
 “ poor, and afflicted, and despised, and insulted,
 “ by the men of this world.

“ It

“ It was also the design of JOHN, by these words,
 “ to express himself so as to remove every doubt
 “ from the minds of his readers, especially those of
 “ them who had not before heard of CHRIST.
 “ For, if he had not added these words, any one
 “ might with reason have fallen into the error into
 “ which we see that most men have now fallen,
 “ though not without being culpable herein: *i. e.*
 “ he might have supposed that the *Word*, about
 “ whom JOHN wrote, was, or at least had been,
 “ in a former state, a different person from the
 “ man JESUS: and perhaps, being tinged with
 “ the PLATONIC Philosophy, when he saw that he
 “ was here called GOD, had been in the beginning
 “ with GOD, and that the world was made by him,
 “ would be immediately persuaded that our Evan-
 “ gelist undoubtedly wrote in conformity to the no-
 “ tions of PLATO, who advanced some things
 “ concerning the divine Being, from whence I am
 “ convinced the origin of the doctrine of the Tri-
 “ nity, universally received, may be traced: for
 “ it is very consonant to the writings of PLATO
 “ and his Disciples, such as JAMBlichus and others,
 “ who yet appear to have drawn their sentiments
 “ from MERCURIUS TRISMEGISTUS.

“ The works of some, who have not scrupled
 “ to support their notions of the Trinity by the

“ authority of these writers, prove this to be the
 “ real truth of the matter. JOHN, therefore, see-
 “ ing this and all the evils that might arise from the
 “ metaphorical manner of speaking he adopted,
 “ plainly asserts that the *Word* was not any way an
 “ incorporeal substance or divine and eternal na-
 “ ture, but a *Man*, and in this way hath entirely
 “ removed every doubt. He hath also made use
 “ of the word *flesh*, not *man*, that by this term he
 “ might oppose another evil we have mentioned.
 “ And notwithstanding he hath excellently done
 “ this by using the plainest terms, yet hath not
 “ SATAN, equally an adversary to us and to the
 “ truth, desisted from his endeavours, since he hath
 “ persuaded men that the word *εγενετο* signifies here
 “ not *was*, but *was made*; and hath converted what
 “ would have always furnished the strongest argu-
 “ ment to exterminate out of the Church of CHRIST
 “ these PLATONIC errors into the most powerful
 “ support of all falsehood. Yet it is surprising that
 “ so many learned divines and men of distinguished
 “ parts should have fallen into this opinion that the
 “ word *εγενετο* ought to be translated *was made*, when,
 “ besides innumerable other absurdities, these two
 “ are evidently occasioned by it. For what can be
 “ more absurd than that the Evangelist, having
 “ before said that the *Word was in the world*, came
 “ to his own, and gave them who believed in him
 “ power

“ power to become the Sons of God, should then
 “ add that the *word was made flesh*? As if he came
 “ to us *before he was born*, and was first in the world
 “ and then *was made flesh*. And though any one
 “ should, by some art, sail clear of this rock, how
 “ can he avoid striking against another, *viz.* that the
 “ *Word, i. e.* as they interpret it, the eternal Son
 “ of God, and even God himself, JEHOVAH, was
 “ made flesh? What can be conceived more harsh,
 “ what more impossible, than that God was made
 “ flesh? Who is not seized with horror and trem-
 “ bling at the thought?

“ They say, indeed, that the words may bear this
 “ construction: yet, by an easy explication, we as-
 “ sert that the phrase, the *word was made flesh*, means
 “ only that it took flesh in the womb of the Virgin.
 “ A curious interpretation indeed! But from whence
 “ do they derive it? What parallel passage can
 “ they alledge from Scripture that will bear this in-
 “ terpretation, without explaining the divine Ora-
 “ cles unskilfully and foolishly? To this let it be
 “ added, it is not less absurd to say that God as-
 “ sumed flesh, than that he was made flesh; as they
 “ themselves shew, when they tell us, that the man-
 “ ner how this was done cannot be at all explained
 “ or conceived.

“ By this plea indeed SATAN may defend the
 “ plainest errors. For, by a forced application
 “ of a text or two, he still defends, in Popery, the
 “ change of the Bread of the Eucharist into the
 “ Body of CHRIST, (notwithstanding it is most ab-
 “ surd, and the falsehood of it is clearly discovered
 “ both by reason and sense,) against the weight of
 “ the most convincing reasons and most solid argu-
 “ ments, from which it is most clear it undergoes no
 “ change, whilst he says, that we ought simply to
 “ believe it, and that it is a mystery which surpasses
 “ human conception. This is the reason that num-
 “ bers, although they actually see and feel the piece
 “ of bread to be still bread, yet, seduced by a blind
 “ error, persuade themselves that it is no longer
 “ bread but the body of CHRIST,

“ We see the case to be the same as to the senti-
 “ ments we are to entertain concerning GOD and
 “ CHRIST. For notwithstanding it evidently ap-
 “ pears impossible that the indivisible and un-
 “ changeable essence of GOD, either with respect
 “ to its Personality, as they call it, or substance,
 “ should assume flesh, so as, by this taking of flesh,
 “ to become what they stile one Hypostasis: much
 “ more that it should happen to the Son only, and
 “ not to the Father and the Holy Spirit, which
 “ three, they contend, constitute the one simple
 “ Essence

“ Essence of God ; though nothing can be ima-
 “ gined more absurd (and all nature exclaims against
 “ it) than that three are one and one three ; from
 “ which notion innumerable and shocking absur-
 “ dities necessarily arise, to the entire subversion of
 “ the divine and sacred Oracles ; yet I cannot ac-
 “ count for it, the generality of Christians are so
 “ bewitched or so stupid, as not only firmly to be-
 “ lieve all these things but to think that their salva-
 “ tion depends on this faith : and men, imposing
 “ upon and deceiving themselves, are fully con-
 “ vinced that they do not see what they do see, and
 “ see what they do not see : and, as we have said
 “ concerning the eucharistical bread in Popery, if
 “ any one endeavour to expose this great error by
 “ the strongest arguments and the clearest testimo-
 “ nies of Scripture, they cry out, it is a mystery,
 “ which he ought not to examine but adore.

“ But as the monstrous and sophistical notion of
 “ the Eucharist has been, by the help of God so
 “ plainly exposed that even children, with reason,
 “ laugh at and explode it, and it is now evident
 “ that what was reckoned the most divine mystery
 “ of the Christian Religion is the grossest idolatry,
 “ so we hope that the shocking fictions concerning
 “ our God and his CHRIST, which at present are sup-
 “ posed to be sacred and worthy of the deepest
 “ reverence,

“ reverence, and to constitute the principal myste-
 “ ries of our religion, will (although the world in
 “ the mean time rage and practise the cruelties of
 “ fire and sword) with God’s permission, be so laid
 “ open and treated with such scorn, that every one
 “ will be ashamed to embrace them or even bestow
 “ any attention on them*.”

It will serve to diversify this work and to afford instruction, if I take this opportunity to throw in the following anecdote and quotation.

“ We have a well-authenticated account of a
 “ very remarkable effect produced by the casual
 “ reading of this prologue of St. JOHN’S Gospel.
 “ It concerns no less a person than the famous
 “ FRANCISCUS JUNIUS, joint-translator of the
 “ Bible into *Latin* with TREMELLIUS, and author
 “ of other learned works, who flourished towards
 “ the close of the fifteenth century. This worthy
 “ person, it seems, notwithstanding the careful edu-
 “ cation of a pious father, had fallen in his youth
 “ into some unhappy sceptical notions about reli-
 “ gion. His escape from them he himself thus
 “ describes, in the *History of his own Life*.

“ My father, who was frequently reading the
 “ New Testament, and had long observed, with
 “ grief,

* SOCINI Opera, tom. i. p. 77. col. 2. p. 84. col. 1.

“ grief, the progress I had made in infidelity, had
 “ put that book into my way, in that library of his,
 “ in order to attract my attention, if it might please
 “ GOD to bless his design, though without giving
 “ me the least intimation of it. Here therefore I
 “ unwittingly open this New Testament, thus
 “ providentially laid before me. At the very first
 “ view, as I was deeply engaged in other thoughts,
 “ that grand chapter of the Evangelist and Apostle
 “ presents itself to me, *In the beginning was the*
 “ *word, &c.* I read part of the chapter, and was
 “ so affected in reading it, that I became instantly
 “ struck with the divinity of the argument and the
 “ majesty and authority of the composition, as in-
 “ finitely surpassing the highest flights of human
 “ eloquence. My body shuddered; my mind was
 “ all in amazement; and I was so agitated the
 “ whole day that I scarce knew who I was. Thou
 “ didst remember me, O LORD my GOD, accord-
 “ ing to thy boundless mercy, and didst bring back
 “ the lost sheep to thy flock! From that day that
 “ GOD wrought so mightily in me by the power of
 “ his spirit, I began to have less relish for all other
 “ studies and pursuits, and bent myself with greater
 “ ardour and attention to every thing which had a
 “ relation to GOD.”

“ The good effect which the accidental perusal
 “ of this portion of holy Scripture produced in this
 “ learned

“ learned person cannot be doubted. It was in-
 “ strumental, by the providence of God, (without
 “ which nothing happens,) in bringing him off from
 “ irreligious principles to the belief of the Christian
 “ religion, to piety and a good life. But it must
 “ not be supposed to have been owing to any parti-
 “ cular efficacy in the words or sentiments them-
 “ selves to make an unbeliever a Christian, of which
 “ they are utterly incapable : before such effect
 “ could be wrought by them, on any rational
 “ grounds, enquiry must have been made who the
 “ writer of them was, what the value and credibi-
 “ lity of his testimony concerning JESUS and the
 “ other things related by him ; and full satisfaction
 “ obtained on these points.

“ If a man has a general knowledge beforehand
 “ of the doctrines and the evidence for the truth of
 “ the Christian Revelation, (which this worthy per-
 “ son retained from his religious education,) but is
 “ doubtful or wavering concerning it in some parts
 “ or in the whole, in such a state of mind and in
 “ such circumstances, the majesty of the subject and
 “ the dignity and authority with which the Apostle
 “ delivers himself might strike the imagination to
 “ the degree that JUNIUS describes concerning
 “ himself, and give an entire turn to his thoughts
 “ and conduct. I make no doubt but the same
 “ happy

“ happy consequences would have followed, had
 “ the same passage been read as we have rendered
 “ it: In the beginning was wisdom; and wisdom
 “ was with God; and wisdom was God, &c. &c.
 “ which is at least equally sublime, striking and ma-
 “ jestic. But the interpretation of the Apostle’s
 “ words is not to be decided by their accidental
 “ influence on particular persons and according to
 “ their acceptation of them. This is to be sought
 “ for, and can only be ascertained by a knowledge
 “ and study of the original language of the sacred
 “ writings, by comparing those writings with
 “ themselves, (for they are connected and harmo-
 “ nious, and illustrate each other throughout,) and
 “ by a diligent attention to the stile and sentiments
 “ of the writer we are interpreting*.”

No. 2. GENESIS i. 26. *Let us make Man.*

“ It hath been the usual practice, in every lan-
 “ guage, to use the plural number, when any
 “ one exhorts himself, though alone, to do any thing,
 “ or determines to do it, if he expresses himself
 “ in that form which would require the subjunctive
 “ mood in the *Greek* or *Latin*; as in *LIVY*, lib. 39.
 “ *HANNIBAL*, when he is voluntarily about to
 “ swallow poison, says, *Let us deliver the Roman peo-*
 “ *ple from a perpetual trouble*†.

No.

* *LINDSEY’s Sequel to the Apology*, p. 151—156.

† *SOCINI Opera*, p. 142. col. 1.

No. 3. PHILIPPIANS ii. 6, 7.

Who being in the Form of GOD thought it not Robbery to be equal with GOD; but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Man.

“ JESUS, ver. 1. is the proper name of a man,
 “ and CHRIST signifies anointed, and therefore
 “ necessarily relates to a man; for the divine nature cannot be anointed, nor has any need of
 “ unction. Besides, CHRIST is plainly, in this
 “ passage, held up to our imitation: but how could
 “ CHRIST be proposed for our imitation in those
 “ things which he did before he was born as a man,
 “ which no eye did or could see? Is it not evident that patterns must be drawn from what is
 “ known, and therefore the actions of CHRIST,
 “ held forth to our imitation, must be such as were
 “ by some means visible? PAUL then speaks of
 “ the man JESUS who was called CHRIST, and
 “ shews that we are bound to resemble him. For,
 “ notwithstanding he was *ἐν μορφῇ*, in the likeness
 “ or form of GOD, since he commanded the sea and
 “ the winds, and diseases and infirmities, and death
 “ itself, and lastly the dæmons, and they obeyed
 “ him, and, in a word, whether present or absent,
 “ performed in all places whatever he pleased;
 “ yet,

“ yet, when the time came and it seemed fit to GOD
 “ his Father, he laid aside this apparent equality
 “ with GOD, (for he did not regard it as rapine, but
 “ always esteemed it as what had been given him)
 “ and assuming, *μορφην*, the likeness or form of a
 “ servant, or a vile slave, suffered himself to be
 “ seized by wicked men, to be injuriously treated,
 “ to be beaten, to be spit upon and to be mocked,
 “ so that he appeared to differ in nothing from the
 “ generality of men: and so obedient was he to his
 “ Father, that he did not decline to undergo death
 “ itself at his command, even the death of the cross,
 “ which the *Jews* considered as the most cruel and
 “ accursed. For this condescension and obedience
 “ to the commands of his Father, he received a
 “ reward too great and glorious for tongue to ex-
 “ press or thought to conceive. Therefore we ought
 “ to think humbly of ourselves; and, though we
 “ excel other men in some gift of GOD, if it so seem
 “ good to him, should submit to be in a manner
 “ deprived of it, and not use it as our own right.
 “ So shall we in the end be signally rewarded by
 “ GOD*.”

“ *Μορφη*, *Form*: this word, perhaps, occurs in no
 “ other place in the New Testament, except
 “ in MARK xvi. 12. where it signifies solely
 “ the

* Tom. ii. p. 381. col. 1.

“ the external form, and the *Latin* translator has
 “ rendered it *effigie*. And it is to be observed, that
 “ CHRIST also is there spoken of, and it is said that
 “ he appeared to his two disciples as they were
 “ walking into the country in *another form*. As
 “ then it is there said of CHRIST that he appeared in
 “ *another form*, which is the same as if it had been
 “ said, that he appeared when he was in another
 “ form, and it plainly means, that he had a different
 “ appearance or external form : so, in this passage,
 “ that CHRIST was in the form of GOD, signifies no
 “ more than that he had a divine appearance or
 “ a divine external form*.

“ *And was made in the likeness of men, and being*
 “ *found in fashion as a man*. These words are not
 “ properly an explanation of what was before as-
 “ serted, *viz.* that CHRIST took the form of a servant,
 “ but constitute another (and not very different
 “ kind of) opposition to what PAUL had before
 “ said, *viz.* that CHRIST was in the form of GOD ;
 “ to which he adds, by way of contrast, that he
 “ was in all outward respects like other men. For
 “ *Psal. lxxxii. 6.* shews that the term *men* is used to
 “ mean the generality of the race, or common
 “ men ; where ASAPH says, that the men whom he
 “ had called *Gods and Sons of the Highest should die*
 “ as

“ as Men: i. e. as other common men. And there
 “ is, in that passage, a tacit opposition or antithesis
 “ between God and man, greatly resembling that
 “ in the passage before us; and that with respect to
 “ one and the same persons, who, as to nature, had
 “ nothing but what was human. This is of conse-
 “ quence to illustrate the place we are considering,
 “ and to shew, that, in one and the same CHRIST,
 “ although he had only a human nature, God
 “ might be opposed to man*.”

No. 4. 2 CORINTHIANS viii. 9.

Though he was rich, yet for your Sakes he became poor, that ye, through his Poverty, might be rich.

“ PAUL does not here mean the riches of
 “ CHRIST that are or may be opposed to calamity,
 “ but he means, in this passage, that CHRIST had
 “ riches of the same kind as those about which he
 “ elsewhere writes to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. i. 5.
 “ that they were enriched by CHRIST JESUS in all
 “ utterance and in all knowledge, so that, as to spiritual
 “ riches, they wanted no gift: and addressing the same
 “ persons, ch. iv. 8. he says, Now ye are full; now ye
 “ are rich: ye have reigned as kings without us, and
 “ I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign

D d

“ with

* Ut supra.

“ *with you.* That he is here discoursing of the gifts
 “ of the Holy Spirit is evident from the preceding
 “ words, by which he admonishes them to learn
 “ from his and APOLLO’S example not to be elated
 “ and puffed up one against another on account of
 “ the gifts bestowed upon them from heaven. But
 “ why need I quote other examples? Are not the
 “ words, *that ye, through his poverty, might be made*
 “ *rich,* in this very passage, to be understood of
 “ riches of this kind? For not the temporal ad-
 “ vantages, but the spiritual blessings, of the *Corin-*
 “ *thians* were augmented by CHRIST, as is shewn
 “ and expressed in the former quotations. The
 “ sense therefore of this passage is, that CHRIST,
 “ though he was enriched with spiritual gifts and
 “ divine powers whilst he preached the gospel of
 “ the kingdom of God, did not afterwards employ
 “ them, but did, as it were, lay aside and suffer the
 “ loss of those divine endowments; then especially
 “ when he suffered himself to be seized, to be
 “ mocked, to be beaten, to be scourged, and in the
 “ end to be crucified.

“ And as CHRIST did all this for our sakes, the
 “ Apostle with justice acknowledges his great bene-
 “ ficence towards us, and that we are enriched by
 “ his poverty. For the same PAUL, in another
 “ place, *Eph. ii. 13.* says, *that the Gentiles, who were*
 “ *once*

“ *once afar off, are made nigh by the blood of CHRIST:*

“ *i. e. they who were not the people of GOD are*

“ *made the people of GOD, and so enriched with*

“ *many spiritual gifts of which they were before en-*

“ *tirely destitute. Therefore, addressing here the Co-*

“ *rinthians, who were Gentiles, he says, for your*

“ *sakes, and that ye might be rich.*

“ It is to be observed, the Apostle uses no term

“ which shews that the riches of CHRIST could not

“ subsist at the same time with his poverty or be-

“ coming poor: he only simply says, that CHRIST

“ *was poor when he was rich, ἐπὶ ὧν χευσσε πλεσιος ὢν,*

“ which form of expression seems plainly to shew

“ that at the same period of time he was rich and

“ poor.

“ To this be it added, that if any one should ob-

“ stinately deny that PAUL, when he said CHRIST

“ was rich, spoke of spiritual riches, at least he

“ cannot deny that he is rich who enjoys the means

“ and power of possessing any riches he pleases:

“ but that CHRIST, during his abode on earth, had

“ the means of procuring the greatest riches and af-

“ fluence, by the exertion of that power by which

“ he wrought so many other wonders, every one, I

“ suppose, will confess. But since he declined this

“ and chose poverty*, PAUL with great propriety

D d 2

“ says,

* Tom. ii. p. 501. col. 2,

“ says, he was poor for our sakes. For the word
 “ *πρωχέειν*, when you depart from the signification of
 “ *begging*, which sense it also bears, signifies to *be*
 “ *poor*, but not, I think to *be made poor*. As I was
 “ carefully seeking after the useful and proper
 “ meaning of this word, I met with a lexicon in
 “ which are these words: PAUL, speaking of our
 “ Saviour, saith, 2 Cor. viii. ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπρωχέυσε,
 “ *i. e.* for your sakes, like a beggar, having nothing,
 “ he wanted the help of others, when yet he was
 “ rich. From whence it appears that the author,
 “ whoever he was, (but he was certainly skilled in
 “ the *Greek* language,) in interpreting the word
 “ *πρωχέειν* in this passage, was plainly of my opinion,
 “ that it signifies not *to become poor*, but to be like
 “ a poor person ; and that he also thought, as I do,
 “ that these riches of CHRIST might consist with
 “ his poverty*.”

— Tom. ii. p. 502. col. i.

APPENDIX

A P P E N D I X. II.

An Account of the POLONIAN Brethren.

THE *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* is a collection of the expositions and treatises of the most eminent SOCINIAN writers. It forms all together a complete commentary on the New Testament. The authors, whose works appear under this general name, are JOHN CRELLIUS, JONAS SLICHTINGIUS, JOHN LODOVIC WOLTZOGENIUS and SAMUEL PRZIPCOWIUS.

This collection, however, it has been observed, scarcely deserves to be called the Library of the *Polonian Brethren*: for, besides not containing all the pieces of the writers who form it, we have in it none of the works of VOLKELIUS, OSTODORUS, SMALCIUS, VERIDORIUS, MORSCOWIUS, and
D d 3 others

others, who were men of distinguished reputation in this sect. Nor does it present us with any of their public creeds or confessions of faith. It is computed not more than a tenth part of the antient SOCINIAN writers are to be found here; yet we meet with many pieces that were never before published, or were never printed at *Racow*, and which are rarely to be procured separately.

ANDREAS WITSOWATIUS was greatly assistant to this publication. He threw the distinct parts into a proper order, and corrected the press; having removed from *Manheim* to *Amsterdam* for this purpose. Others, whose names are not known, are supposed to have been promoters of the work. It made its appearance from the press and at the charge of the BLAVII, printers at *Amsterdam*, who were of the REMONSTRANT party, but friends and patrons of some that were suspected of SOCINIANISM. Purchasers of it may be cautioned against buying the copy which wants the prints of the principal authors and the works of PRZIPCOWIUS*.

The works of SOCINUS were printed in this collection from a copy corrected in many places by a man of distinguished learning. In this edition of the

* FR. S. BOCK, *Historia ANTITRINITARIORUM*, maxime SOCINIANISMI, Tom. i. pars i. p. 51, 52, 54.

the works of CRELLIUS, the long disputation, drawn up by another pen and annexed to his Christian Ethics, is left out: the indexes are corrected and retrenched of many superfluous and useless articles: and GROTIUS's treatise on the satisfaction of CHRIST, and his two Letters to CRELLIUS, in which he thanks him for his answer to his own book, are annexed to CRELLIUS's piece on that subject.

In the third tome of the expository works of CRELLIUS are contained some critiques taken by others from his lectures, but not revised by himself. To the works of WOLTZOGENIUS are added an Exposition on the Acts of the Apostles, and on the Epistles of JAMES and JUDE by ANDREAS WITSO-WATIUS, an UNITARIAN Minister, and grandson to FAUSTUS SOCINUS: and also a Commentary on the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th chapters of JOHN's Gospel, by JOACHIM STEGMANNUS, junior, a Minister in *Poland*, and, after the UNITARIANS were driven out of that kingdom, a Pastor of a Church of that denomination, at *Clauseberg*, in *Saxony*. These Expositions were given the world to complete the Commentaries on the New Testament by the SOCINIAN writers*.

Some more particular account of these authors will probably be acceptable to the reader.

D d 4

The

* *Bibliotheca Fratr. Polon.* Vol. iv. Præf. p. iv.

The name of CRELLIUS stands in this collection next to that of SOCINUS. He was born *July 26, O. S. 1590*, on a farm near *Kittinga*, a town in *Franconia*. His father, JOHN CRELLIUS, was Minister of the LUTHERAN persuasion, and a man of piety and learning; his mother was descended from a good family, and was a woman adorned with every female virtue and excellence.

The quick conception and tenacious memory with which it soon appeared that he was blessed, engaged his parents to bestow a particular attention on his education: and, at ten years of age, after he had imbibed at home the first principles of religion and literature, they removed him to a public seminary at *Norimberg*. Here he spent three years to great advantage; and the brightness of his parts and the modesty of his manners gained him applause from his tutors and his relation JOHN KLINGIUS, with whom he lived, a gentleman of great authority in that republic. He afterwards studied in some other towns in *Germany* under eminent Professors, and at every place received honourable testimonials to his manners and learning.

He was not satisfied with the acquisition of one or two branches of knowledge, nor could his capacious mind be confined within those limits to which
the

the academical pursuits of persons of inferior abilities are limited; but it ranged through the wide field of knowledge and penetrated into the depths of science. Before he had made these attainments he had acquired an accurate skill in the *Latin* language and was well acquainted with *Greek* and *Hebrew*. As his guide to the sublime studies of Philosophy, he took ARISTOTLE and his interpreters; at least those of them who wrote in a superior strain to that of the subtle and doting schoolmen.

When CRELLIUS had made more than common attainments in every branch of literature and science, he was affected with a conviction that he was still ignorant of what was more important than all other sciences, namely, a pure knowledge of GOD and CHRIST. He had some time before conceived a dislike for that system of theology in which he had been educated; and never could swallow the absurdities of the doctrine of predestination: but now, assisted by the hints communicated to him by some students at the university of *Altorf*, he pursued his enquiries with more freedom.

About the year 1610 the academical senate nominated him to the post of Inspector of the youth of the republic of *Altorf*: but CRELLIUS, fearful that the duties of this office could not be discharged with

a good conscience, was desirous of handsomely declining a post which others ambitiously sought after. Before it appeared that he was determined not to accept it, some, who were candidates for this post, secured him, though through no generous motives, from the displeasure an obstinate refusal might have drawn upon him: for they instilled into the Senators and Curators of the university a suspicion of his being a CALVINIST; as they did not know there were grounds to fix upon him the guilt of a more odious name, and which would have been more injurious to him.

It happily fell out, at that time, that, among the students, it was debated whether CHRIST, as man, was the object of adoration. CRELLIUS supported the affirmative side of the question with some arguments which he had drawn from other sources than from the principles of the LUTHERANS, and with a view to serve a cause he esteemed better than theirs. As his intentions were not known, but to those who had the same object in view, he was acquitted from the charge of CALVINISM. Upon this the Curators of the university resumed their design of making him President of the youth: but, in a modest petition, he chose rather to refuse than accept either the honours or the burthens of the office.

One

One obstruction to the wishes of CRELLIUS was removed but not the fear of others: for other honours, customary in the universities of *Germany*, awaited him, and his learning opened his way to public posts and preferments, which he thought were to be despised by him, as he saw he could not accept them without swearing to human formularies and confessions of faith. Other impediments to the enjoyment of liberty arose from his family connections, particularly from the views of that relation, whose patronage he had enjoyed from his childhood, and whose hopes and labours appeared to be all lost, if his kinsman did not join the LUTHERAN Church, for which he had educated him. It greatly distressed the mind of this excellent youth to find that he could not please both God and those friends to whom, in the next place, his attachment and obedience were due: it appeared also, in his view, base, to yield to men the freedom of his mind, which ought to be subject to God alone. He thought therefore that the favour or resentment of his greatest friends was in that case to be despised, and that every obstacle was to be gently removed or resolutely surmounted.

When, at length, he could no longer continue where he was, and enjoy liberty of conscience, he began in earnest to entertain a design of retreating
to

to some country where it would be lawful to think freely and to speak what he thought. *Poland* was the country upon which he fixed for his residence, though he had never seen it, and knew he had no friends there, otherwise than he supposed that the friends of truth would be his.

He left *Norimberg* in *November*, 1612, and travelled on foot unattended with any companions to beguile the difficulties of his journey till he came to *Cracow*; from thence, on the thirteenth of *December*, he reached *Racow*, where he fixed his residence, and died.

He there obtained his wishes: for, soon after his arrival, he was received into the communion of the UNITARIAN Churches and indulged with the intimate friendship of their pastors. Soon after, he was received into the court of JACOB SIENIENIUS, Palatine of *Podolia*. CRELLIUS did not abuse the kindness of this nobleman to indulge luxury or sloth, nor did he busy himself in state-employments; but consecrated his leisure to theological studies, attending on the lectures of SMALCIUS, and holding conferences with HIERONYMUS MOSCOROVIVS.

In *May*, 1613, he was appointed, by a resolution of the Synod at *Racow*, Corrector of the Press for the

the *German* and *Latin* publications, and Professor of *Greek* in the University there.

He preached in private for two years, in the *German*, *Latin* and *Polish* languages: and in the year 1615 SMALCIUS introduced him into a public character, and in the month of *July* he preached his first sermon to the church. In this manner he employed the three years and a half he spent in the court of his noble patron. In 1616 he was chosen Rector of the University; and this office, upon which he entered only for a year, he filled for five years, to his own improvement and the public advantage. In the same year on which he undertook the management of the University he married the daughter of SIMON PISTAR, an UNITARIAN Minister at *Czarkovia*, greatly esteemed for his learning and piety. By this lady, who was a religious woman and surpassed most of her sex in prudence, he had three sons and three daughters, all of whom survived him.

In the year 1622, CRELLIUS resigned the Rectorship of the University and resumed the ministerial character; and, a plague breaking out at *Racow* about this time, to avoid infection he withdrew from the town. On the death of SMALCIUS he was chosen colleague in the government of the Church -

Church with his successor CHRISTOPHER LUBI-
ENIECIUS.

It is needless to follow him through the occurrences of the ten following years, during which he discharged the pastoral function: he was so assiduous and diligent in the duties of it that he scarcely allowed himself lawful relaxation, and his friends found it necessary to lay some restraint upon his labours. Scarcely a day passed in which he did not preach, or was not engaged in giving advice or administering comfort, or encouraging some to virtue, or reproving others, or in clearing up some difficult passage of Scripture. These labours might be easily discharged by one who was free from other engagements; but to CRELLIUS these duties were only a change of his usual and daily employment: for he expounded the sacred Scriptures to students in divinity; and these lectures were often attended by persons greatly skilled in theological subjects, who were not to be dismissed, if he wished them to renew their attendance, with trite and jejune remarks: but these hearers were so well pleased with what they learned from CRELLIUS, that they deemed his lectures worthy of the public eye. Therefore, what he either expressly advanced or slightly hinted, upon their return home, they digested and committed to writing.

In

In this manner were formed his Commentaries upon the Epistles to the *Galatians* and the *Hebrews*; the former published in his life-time, the other after his death. He expounded the other books of the New Testament in the same manner; and the Expositions were afterwards published from like minutes. Indeed, it raises our admiration of the strength of his genius, to be informed, that very few of his works were published from manuscripts which he had drawn up with his own pen, but most were dictated from memory, and even without the assistance of notes. And when he was dictating he was often attacked by objections from different quarters, started by the scribes, who in general were no novices: yet he replied fully and immediately to these objections; and interwove these answers so regularly and handsomely with the thread of the discourse and in their proper places as, scarcely any other person could have done, though he had directed his whole attention to this point only and used the assistance of his pen.

Death prematurely removed this great man in the vigour of life and amidst his schemes of usefulness: for on the second of *May*, 1633, when, on the festival of *Whitsuntide*, there were assembled, from very remote parts, the principal members of the UNITARIAN Church, after having preached by request

request on 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18. he complained of being indisposed. It soon appeared that he was seized with an infectious fever then prevalent at *Racow*, and with which one of his sons was confined to his bed. At the beginning of his sickness, as if he prefigured his approaching death, in the presence of one of his friends, he fervently begged of God, with many tears, to forgive his sins, and to preserve him from the delirium that attended that kind of fever. In the progress of his disorder, he discharged from his breast a great quantity of phlegm, as he lay down, which was a symptom that usually proved fatal to persons who, through age or the tenderness of their constitution, had not strength to contend with it: it obstructed the organs of speech in CRELLIUS, that with much difficulty he could utter an intelligible word: but what could be understood discovered firmness of mind, and a soul breathing after divine things.

On the eleventh of *June*, when there remained no hopes of his life, after they had offered most fervent prayers for him in the public assembly, a company, attended with the minister, visited him, to take their last farewell: they found him at the point of death; but, on their entrance into his chamber, he was raised up to express, as well as he could, his gratitude for this proof of their affection, and to bestow

bestow on them, with hands raised to heaven, his last blessing. The whole company then fell upon their knees, and, whilst they were pouring out their prayers mingled with many groans and tears, he calmly breathed his last, in the 43d year of his age.

A little before his death, on account of his sight failing, it was resolved, by a vote of the Synod, that the Brethren should assist CRELLIUS in copying his works, and on certain hours every day should write as he dictated. KRZYSKIEVICIUS was allowed him by the Synod as an *amanuensis* for this purpose, who took this office upon himself; but, not going through the labours of it, the finishing of the business was assigned to RUARUS, as the most proper person in the *Racovian Church**.

CRELLIUS left three sons, THEOPHILUS, CHRISTOPHER and JOHN: the second of whom was the father of the famous SAMUEL CRELLIUS†. Under the head of CRELLIUS, prefixed to his Works, we meet with these distichs.

CRELLIUS *hos oculos, hæc ora modesta gerebat:*

Sic animo mitis cum pietate fuit.

Hunc cito mors rapuit nimis; at per viva manebit

Scripta, quibus vivos post sua fata docet.

E e

Hæc

* S. Bock, Hist. ANTITR. T. i. pars I. p. 127.

† Id. p. 161, 162.

*Hæc lege, qui mores, qui sacra volumina nosse,
Qui cupis accenso cœlitus igne frui.*

Amongst the virtues which formed the character of CRELLIUS, next to piety towards God, of which he was almost a perfect pattern, his *Modesty* deserved a second place in an encomium on him: His countenance, his voice, his eyes, his gait, all his actions, all his words, expressed this virtue; which was not diminished but increased by all the honours and testimonials his merit received. He had the lowest opinion of himself; and was more easy under reproaches and abuse, which he never deserved, than under the just praises bestowed on his distinguished merit. His *Courteousness* was so eminent that he not only condescended to converse with, but would first accost, persons of the lowest station: and his amiable manners softened and subdued his enemies. His *Meekness* was so great, that (unless his friends had heard to the contrary from himself, and the strict discipline he maintained in the University, during his Rectorship, had shewn the praise of it was not to be wholly ascribed to nature,) any one would suppose he had not so much conquered, as never felt, the passion of anger. His conduct furnished various instances of admirable *Fortitude*. It appeared remarkably on the occasion of a fire breaking out in his house; which consumed his house and many things

things the greatest activity could not rescue from the flames: but, amidst all the confusion and distress of such a scene, he preserved that firmness of mind, it is said, that a stranger would have sooner discovered from the countenance and manner of every one present that his house was in flames than from that of CRELLIUS himself: nay, such was the solicitude that he expressed for the safety of his neighbours, and such their mutual activity in necessary measures for each other's security, that, whilst they were solicitous for his safety, he seemed to think them only in danger. This behaviour also shewed what little value he set upon the goods of fortune. He was perfectly contented with his moderate yearly salary: and he used his income so frugally that he expended no more than was necessary for a temperate table and decent cloathing; the overplus he employed in relieving the wants of others. In short, such a constellation of virtues were united in CRELLIUS, that he did not more justly deliver the precepts of virtue in his ethics than he beautifully exemplified them in his life.

I will only add that his *Prudence* was most conspicuous in the government of the Church: all things prospered under his direction; and, in the administration of discipline, he regarded neither the

resentment nor the favour of any man, and yet generally avoided giving offence.

Indeed, when, by integrity of life and blameless manners, CRELLIUS displayed an example of all virtue, so as to excite in every breast an admiration of his supreme love to God, of his zeal for the divine glory, of his readiness to every duty, and of the perfect innocence of his deportment in every part of life, it is not surprising that they acquiesced in the counsels, admonitions and directions of so good a man, and that the divine Being smiled on such distinguished virtue, and was propitious, for his sake, to the Church over which he presided. His virtues indeed conquered envy and hatred, and drew applause from those whom a difference of sentiments and an ill-directed zeal separated from CRELLIUS.

The Works of CRELLIUS, contained in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, are, A Commentary upon the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th, Chapters of MATTHEW'S Gospel, dictated by him. A Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*, written from his Lectures by JONAS SLICHTINGIUS, and not revised by CRELLIUS any farther than to the fourth verse of the fourth chapter. A Paraphrase on the same Epistle, dictated by him. A Commentary on
the

the first *ten* Chapters of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians* written by himself, and also on the fifteenth Chapter of the same Epistle dictated by him. This was his last work, which he entered upon at the repeated and earnest request of his friends, to give them satisfaction on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. He had begun, a few days before his death, to revise and correct it. A translation of it in *Dutch* was printed in 1653. A Commentary on the Epistle to the *Galatians*, written by SLICHTINGIUS from the Lectures of CRELLIUS. A Paraphrase on the same Epistle. A Commentary and Paraphrase on the Epistle to the *Ephesians*. A Commentary and Paraphrase on the Epistles to the *Philippians* and *Colossians*. A Commentary on both the Epistles to the *Thessalonians*. The last eight expository pieces were dictated by CRELLIUS. His Sentiments on the Reasons of the Death of CHRIST, a tract which is a summary of his Answer to GROTIUS. A Commentary on the first Epistle to TIMOTHY, and on those to TITUS and PHILEMON, all three written from the Lectures of CRELLIUS by PETRUS MORSKOVIUS. A Commentary on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; this was the work of SLICHTINGIUS, but he was chiefly indebted to the assistance of CRELLIUS in investigating the sense of that Epistle. A Paraphrase on the same Epistle dictated by himself. A Commentary on the two first Chap-

ters of the first Epistle of PETER; and Explications of difficult Passages of the New Testament, both written by CRELLIUS. A Commentary on various Passages in the Gospels of MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE:—On great Part of JOHN's Gospel:—On great Part of the Acts of the Apostles:—On many Chapters and Passages in the Epistles of PAUL:—On the second Epistle to TIMOTHY:—On many Passages in the Catholic Epistles:—On great Part of the REVELATIONS. Some Sermons. An Answer to GROTIUS on the Satisfaction of CHRIST. In which piece, says Bock, though drawn up in defence of a bad cause, CRELLIUS has given us a specimen of learning and modesty in controversial writing. Two Books concerning the ONE GOD THE FATHER. This tract was first printed at *Racow*, 1631. It was re-printed, with a Refutation, by JOHN HENRY BISTERFIELD, at *Leyden*, 1639. WOLTZOGENIUS translated it into *German*, 1645. The *Dutch* version of it was printed at *Racow*, 1649, and the *English* at *Amsterdam*, 1665. A translation of it into *Greek* was repeatedly determined upon at different Synods, and monies were allotted to defray the expences of it*. A Treatise on the Existence, Names and Perfections of GOD. The Elements of Ethics for the Use of Students. Christian Ethics; to which are prefixed ARISTOTLE'S Ethics,

* S. Bock, Hist. ANTITR. T. i. pars 1. p. 132, 133.

Ethics, corrected and reformed by the sacred Scriptures. This work was begun at the desire of a noble and ingenious friend. His various engagements and premature death prevented CRELLIUS from revising and completing those notes, which were taken from his lips as he dictated, without any previous composition. In his last illness he expressed his wishes that they might be transcribed. A learned friend, at the request of many, procured and collated different copies of it, to form one perfect and correct. RUARUS, STIRNIUS, and STEGMANNUS also, by the direction of the Synod in 1635, had the care of publishing it. — A Treatise on the Holy Spirit. A Piece in Support of religious Toleration. A Collection of Problems with Solutions. Passages collected from his Letters. A Tract on the Obligations to cultivate Piety. A Discourse on Happiness.

The third name in the collection of the *Polonian* Brethren is JOHN LUDOVIC WOLTZOGENIUS. He was a free Baron of *Austria* and a Minister among the Reformed in that country. He was born in the year 1596, and died in *Silesia*, near *Uratistavia*, in 1658. He, with others of the CALVINIST persuasion, was driven from his native country by the persecuting measures of the PAPISTS, choosing rather to lose his estate than wound his conscience.

When he came to *Poland*, he met with some of the works of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, in which were advanced and supported sentiments very opposite to the opinions of CALVIN. The perusal of these books produced in his mind a conviction that the doctrine they contained was more agreeable to the New Testament than that of CALVIN: upon this persuasion he embraced it with joy, as having discovered the Truth, and joined himself to the UNITARIANS in *Poland*, in the profession of their sentiments and the communion of their Church. He partly spent his time in philosophical and mathematical studies, and was partly employed by some of the *Polish* nobility on some honourable transactions; for his learning and singular prudence recommended him to their friendship. He was sent by the Elector of *Brandenburgh* to conduct and deliver his sister to RAKOCIUS, Prince of *Transylvania*, to whom he had promised her in marriage: and he was Secretary to OPALINUS, Palatine of *Posnania*, when he went as ambassador to bring from *France* a wife for ULADISLAUS, King of *Poland*. But WOLTZOGENIUS chiefly devoted himself to *theological* enquiries and contemplations.

After he had discharged the above honourable embassies, he resided at various places in *Poland*, sometimes on the borders of *Prussia* and *Silesia*, and likewise

likewise at *Dantzic*. In the manuscript Acts of the Synods, his name is frequently mentioned with respect and honour. He spent the last years of his life at *Schlichtingheim*, a small town in *Poland*, belonging to the family of the SCHLICHTINGII.

In this place some attempts were made to draw him off from his religious sentiments, but they proved unsuccessful. A little before his death he sent for a LUTHERAN Minister, eminent for his knowledge of the mathematics, and discoursed with him upon some mathematical question. When the Minister dropt to him some hints of his approaching end, and admonished him to attend to the salvation of his soul, WOLTZOGENIUS replied, "that he had designedly entered upon this mathematical conversation at this time, to shew that he was perfectly sensible, and to declare that, in this sound state of his intellects, he did not repent of his writings, but, at the point of death, judged the things which they contained to be the truth*." Under the head of WOLTZOGENIUS, prefixed to his works, are these lines,

Quem pia simplicitas, fides, facundia cælo,

Infractusque malis mens animusque piis,

Commendat, pictor facie, novisse docebit.

Muta

* S. BOCK, Hist. ANTITR. T. i. pars 2. p. 1032, 33, 34.

Muta tamen facies gaudia nulla parit :

At calamo, post fata loquens, oracula reclusit,

Heu! quod non potuit pandere cuncta volens.

He was a man of quick understanding, a strong judgment and pious temper, and distinguished for simplicity, fortitude and integrity.

The works of WOLTZOGNIUS, published in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, are, A Commentary on the four Gospels: that on MATTHEW is introduced with a *Prolegomena* to the New Testament, and is attended with different *Appendixes* or *Dissertations* on different Passages. — An Introduction to the useful Reading of the Scriptures, in which the Nature of the Christian Religion or of the Kingdom of CHRIST is considered. — Three Sermons on JOHN xvii. 3. — A Summary of the Christian Religion. — A View of two contrary Opinions concerning the Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons. — Annotations on SCHLICHTINGIUS's Questions concerning Magistracy, War and Self-Defence. — Annotations on the metaphysical Meditations of RENATUS DESCARTES. — An Answer to SCHLICHTINGIUS's Remarks on his Annotations on the Questions of that Writer on Magistracy, &c.

The

The fourth person who ranks with these writers is JONAS SCHLICHTINGIUS A BUKOWIEC. He was a native of *Poland*; was born in the year 1592, and died in exile at *Selichovia*, in the March of *Brandenburgh*, on Nov. 1, 1661.

Upon the banishment of the SOCINIANS out of *Poland*, the family of the SCHLICHTINGII removed to *Prussia*, where JONAS CHRISTOPHER SCHLICHTINGIUS, a descendant from this stock, exercises at this time the ministerial office among the SOCINIANS who remain on the borders of *Poland**.

Having laid the foundation of his acquaintance with science at *Racow*, April 30, 1616, he went to the University at *Altorf* with some other young gentlemen of the UNITARIAN Church, particularly the son of the Lord-Lieutenant of *Racow*, to whom SCHLICHTINGIUS was appointed private tutor. Just at this time a number of secret SOCINIANS were expelled from this seminary, and some of the adherents to their sentiments were cast into prison. SCHLICHTINGIUS and his companions were permitted to stay some time at *Altorf*, on condition that they lived quietly and did not attempt to make any converts to their opinions. From this place he went with PRZIPCOWIUS and others of their party to

* S. Bock, Hist. ANTITR. Tom. i. pars 2. p. 765.

to *Holland*, and attended the lectures of *EPISCOPIUS*, in the University at *Leyden**. Upon his return into his own country, he was at first Pastor of the *UNITARIAN* Church at *Racovia* and then at *Luclavicia*, was frequently employed in visiting and inspecting very distant Churches, and was often engaged in writing polemical pieces against opponents of note. He was judged peculiarly fit for the former business, because he had great strength of body, and was of a mild, gentle temper. He was therefore not only continually engaged in visiting the Churches through *Poland*, but in 1638 was sent into *Transylvania*, to instil lenient counsels into the minds of those who appeared to treat the *SEMI-JUDAIZERS* with severity. The senate of *Coloswar*, a large city, where the Prince of *Transylvania* used to hold the public assemblies, requested this of the *Polonian* Brethren. He had been sent there on this errand a little before, in the middle of winter, but returned without accomplishing the business†.

By the sentence of the *Comitia* held at *Warsaw*, in the year 1647, he was banished from his country, on account of a confession of faith he published, agreeable to the articles of the Apostles Creed, and drawn up almost wholly in the words of Scripture: and

* *S. Bock*, Hist. ANTITR. T. i. pars 2. p. 766.

† *Idem*, p. 766.

and the piece was burnt by the hands of the common executioner in the public market-place.

The Brethren, who met that year in the Synod at *Dazviensis*, wrote him consolatory letters, in which they endeavoured to encourage and animate him under the calamities he endured. He did not leave *Poland* immediately upon the sentence of banishment being issued out, but lay hid there some time: for although he is not mentioned in the manuscript Acts of the Synods for some time after, yet he publicly officiated at an ordination in the assembly at *Czarcoviensis*, 1651. At another Synod, held at the same place, 1652, he was nominated one of the Moderators; and appears also to have filled a pastoral or academical office at *Luclavicium*, in 1654*.

He passed many years in a state of exile without any certain place of residence, exposed to the will of the enemies of truth; and was necessitated to take up his abode in the country on the other side of the *Neiper*, in the neighbourhood of the barbarians of *Muscovy* and *Crim-Tartary*. Yet in every place he attended to the duties of his function, and, amidst continual apprehensions of persecution and death, which it was lawful for any one to inflict on one outlawed, he preserved a firm equanimity,

* S. Bock, Hist. ANTITR. T. i. pars 2. p. 767.

equanimity, and continued to write with great reputation in defence of what he regarded as the Truth against different opponents to it.

When, in the year 1655, the *Swedes* waged war against *Poland*, and a persecution was begun against all who dissented from the *Romish Religion*, SCHLICHTINGIUS sought the protection of the King of *Sweden*, to whom at that time almost all the *Poles* swore allegiance. Now he applied himself, as far as the public disturbances of the times and his advancing years would allow, to prosecute a work he had been for several years before earnestly solicited by his friends to undertake; this was, to give a commentary on all the books of the *New Testament*. His genius and learning, his knowledge of various languages, his improvements by travelling, and his happy skill in investigating the sense of the Scripture and tracing out the connection of its different periods, peculiarly qualified him for this task.

The last year of his life SCHLICHTINGIUS gave to the revival of his Commentaries. His assiduous labours and sedentary life brought upon him a disorder which he supported with fortitude to the last; when, having implored the divine blessing on his affectionate sons and absent friends, he at length fell asleep in the Lord.

A short time before his death, JEREMIAH GERLACHIUS, Pastor of the CALVINIST Church at *Schlichtingheim*, paid him a visit, to try if he could persuade him to renounce his own sentiments and embrace CALVINISM: to whom SCHLICHTINGIUS declared, that he would adhere, unto his last breath, to the sect which he had defended by preaching and writing.

SCHLICHTINGIUS was held in the highest respect, not only by his own party, to whom his family, mildness of temper, and skill in directing the affairs of the Church, peculiarly recommended and endeared him, but his great learning, piety and liberal disposition were honoured with the praises of those who differed from him. The following lines stand under his head before his expository works.

Hæc veneranda senex gessit SCHLICHTINGIUS ora,

Hæc gravitas vultus plena decoris erat.

His dea Suada sedit labiis; hæc ille resolvens,

Dura licet, poterat saxa movere loco.

Hæc jam muta silent: loquitur tamen ille, loquentem

Audit, et auditum fama loquetur anus.

The following monumental inscription delineates his character.

EPITAPHIUM

E P I T A P H I U M

Viri nobilissimi, reverendi et clarissimi Domini,
JONÆ SCHLICHTINGII DE BUKOWIETZ,

Theologi excellentissimi, Lumen Ecclesiæ,

Patriæ, Familiæ,

Egregium Pietatis Christianæ Exemplar.

Insignibus Laboribus

Pro Veritate DEI gnaviter exantlatis,

Acribus Persecutionibus

Pro eadem fortiter toleratis,

Viva et firma Fide SERVATORI suo ad extremum servata,

Indubitata Spe

Resurrectionis et Gloriæ Filiorum DEI fultus,

Ad Spiritus Justorum consummatos,

Relicto hic terreno tabernaculo,

Ipsis Kalendis Novembribus,

Anno Salutis CIO IOC LXI.

Ætatis suæ LXIX.

Translulit.*

The

* In English thus :

T H E E P I T A P H

Of that most noble, reverend and celebrated Man,
JONAS SCHLICHTINGIUS DE BUKOWIETZ,

A most celebrated Divine,
 An Ornament to the Church, his Country, and Family,
 A bright Pattern of Christian Piety.

Having diligently discharged extraordinary Services, and
 courageously endured severe Persecutions in the
 Cause of Truth;

Having

The only works of SLICHTINGIUS, preserved in the *Biblioth. Fratr. Polon.* are his Commentaries: As he did not begin these till he was sixty years old, his friends desired they might commence with the Gospel of the Evangelist JOHN, as surpassing the rest in the excellence of its matter and in the majesty and sweetness of its style, particularly in the narration of our Lord's discourses before his death. The explanation of this Gospel was begun on the 18th of May, 1656, when the *Polish* general had drawn up his army under the walls of the city of *Cracow**,

F f

and

Having maintained to the last a lively and firm Faith
in his SAVIOUR;

Supported by an unwavering Hope of the Resurrection
and Glory of the Sons of God,

He left behind his earthly Tabernacle,

And joined the Spirits of just Men made perfect,

On the Kalends of November,

In the Year of our Redemption 1661,

And the Sixty-ninth of his Age.

* In the preceding year, CHARLES GUSTAVUS, King of *Sweden*, had invaded *Poland* and seized on the kingdom. CASIMIR, King of *Poland*, most of the Palatines and the principal Senators, left this kingdom: the army of the kingdom with its generals, and *Cracow*, the capital, were obliged to surrender themselves to the protection of the *Swedish* King. In another part of the kingdom, cruel devastations were committed by the *Moscovites* and *Cossacks*. And for some years the *Poles* were engaged in a variety of wars against all their neighbours.

and finished the 23d of *August*. On the next day he entered on his Exposition of the Epistles of JOHN, and completed it in the ensuing *October*: and in this space the *Polish* army had commenced a third siege, which was carried on with more vigour than the two former, and lasted for some months, till it was raised by GEORGE RACOSIUS, Prince of *Transylvania*. On the 31st of *October* he set about his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*, which he pursued with a constant and chearful application amidst the noise of war, the joy of the siege being raised, and the congratulations of the Prince of *Transylvania* on entering the city; and he concluded it on the 3d of *June*, 1657.

On the 11th of the same month he began his Commentary on the first Epistle of PETER; and on the 12th of *July*, when JOHN CASIMIR was besieging the city with an army of *Poles* and *Germans*, the sorrowful news was brought him of the cruel death of his son, who, with another noble youth, both being seized by the *Polish* soldiers, preferred a bitter death to a life which could not be enjoyed without sacrificing conscience and truth. When this news came, he was commenting, in the usual course, on these words, ch. ii. verses 23, 24. *Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him*
that

that judgeth righteously: Who his own self bare out sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. SLICHTINGIUS, more attentive to the dictates of love to the Son of God than of affection to his own son, discovering a mind invincible under every calamity, and mingling with his tears the consolations derived from these words and the example of our Saviour, afforded to those who were around him an admirable pattern of constancy and patience. At length, amidst all the impediments of a fourth siege, he finished this Commentary on the 13th of August.

The next day he entered on his Exposition of the second Epistle of PETER, and had advanced in it to the 17th verse of the first chapter when the city surrendered. There was no prospect of enjoying under this king * that liberty of conscience with which the UNITARIANS had been indulged under

F f 2

SIGISMUND

* This prince, JOHN CASIMIR, at last, grown weary of continual wars abroad, (the severest of which he experienced against the *Swedes*,) and of intestine commotions at home, abdicated the throne, 1664, and retired to *France*, where he was Abbot of *St. Germain des Pretz*. He died in 1672 at *Nevers*; his body was sent to *Warsaw*, but his heart was deposited in the abby, where the monks have erected a monument to his memory. SHARPE'S *Introduction to Universal History*, p. 329.

SIGISMUND his father. Therefore, in *September*, he went from *Cracow*, and fixed his residence in a town near *Poland* and the March of *Brandenburgh*, where he concluded his Commentary on the second Epistle of *PETER*, and proceeded through seven chapters of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

From hence, on account of the rumours of war and through fear of persecution, he removed to *Stetinum*, and took up his abode with *STANISLAUS LUBIENIECIUS*, a Polish Knight, and Pastor of the Church at *Lublin*, who wrote an account of his Life and Commentaries: here he assiduously and successfully pursued his expository labours.

But it pleased God, by numerous trials, to exercise the patience of this holy man: for, at *Stargard*, he was seized and thrown into prison by the guards of *Brandenburgh*, on suspicion, because he came from the city of an enemy. But he was more anxious for his Commentaries than for his personal liberty, as they were taken and with-held from him. He was removed hence on the 13th of *February*, by order of the Elector, to the castle of *Spandaw*. On the 26th day of the same month he began his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, and finished it on the 2d of *April*; thus giving the world, by his labours in such circumstances as well as by his writings,

writings, a fair transcript of the invincible heroism of the Apostle.

As the Epistle to the *Colossians* is parallel to that to the *Ephesians*, on the next day he set about the exposition of it, giving it, on this account, the priority to the Epistle to the *Philippians*. As he was writing, opposite to his notes on ch. i. ver. 13. *Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness*, this short doxology, *Glory to God, the protector of my innocence*, the mandamus of the Elector for his release was brought him. This prince afterwards shewed him much favour, and entertained him for some days at his table. He received again his Commentaries from the hands of the prince of *Anhalt*, to whom they had been sent by the governor of *Stargard*, and was indulged with opportunities of discoursing on Religion in public and private, and of prosecuting his expository labours without new interruptions.

He once more removed, and fixed his residence with a noble and pious lady at *Selichovia*. Here he revised his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*, and, resuming his work where he left off, he pursued it till he concluded with the Epistle to *PHILEMON*, Sept. 13, 1660, as it appears by this note in his own hand: "I finished it by the grace

“ of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, which was with me
 “ at *Selichovia*, *Sept.* 13, 1660.”

Amidst so many difficulties were the Commentaries of SCHLICHTINGIUS drawn up. The publication of them was entrusted to his three sons and two friends; one of whom makes these reflections on this publication.

“ Nothing is to be ascribed to us the Editors;
 “ but to GOD is all the praise of it to be given:
 “ for GOD inspired the design and excited us to
 “ urge the prosecution of this work at *Cracow*,
 “ which, after our dispersion into different places,
 “ we should have had no opportunity of engaging
 “ the Author to begin, or of assisting him in exe-
 “ cuting. GOD endowed his servant with Chris-
 “ tian fortitude to compose the Commentaries in
 “ imprisonment, amidst the terrors of war and the
 “ calamities of five sieges. GOD so guarded them
 “ that they were preserved untouched by the hands
 “ of rapacious soldiers and the violence of flames,
 “ which spare not the most sacred things. GOD,
 “ lastly, smiled on the publication of them, and re-
 “ moved the obstacles that opposed it.”

The candid liberal preface of SCHLICHTINGIUS to these Commentaries shall close our review of his character and labours.

“ I wrote these Commentaries, Reader, not in a
 “ public, but only in my own private capacity; and,
 “ as our Churches were dispersed by a severe per-
 “ secution, I could never submit them to the public
 “ censure. I would not therefore have the Church
 “ charged with a single sentence or word. What
 “ is written or advanced proceeds from a private
 “ person. If truth be advanced, let the public en-
 “ joy the benefit of it; but if any thing said here
 “ be false, I wish it had not been said; and, though
 “ I have said it, I retract it. Farewell*.”

The last person in the list of the *Polonian* Brethren
 is SAMUEL PRZIPCOVIUS, a *Polish* Knight of a
 noble family. He was born about the year 1592,
 and having laid the foundation of his acquaintance
 with literature in his own country, he removed to
 the University at *Altorf* in the year 1614. Upon
 its being discovered that he held the SOCINIAN
 sentiment, he left this place, and, withdrawing to
Holland, studied at the University of *Leyden*; where,
 when he was little more than eighteen, he published
 a piece without his name on the *Peace and Concord*
of the Church, which met with the honour of being
 ascribed to the pen of EPISCOPIUS. About the
 same time he wrote his *Apology* against the severe
 satyr of DANIEL HEINSIUS, entitled, *Cras credo,*

F f 4

hodie

hodie nihil; in which he had poured out all the virulence of wit and raillery on UTENBOGARD, EPISCOPIUS, and other persons of the most distinguished integrity in *Holland*: but with a juvenile but modest ardor our Author repressed the slander of this old man, and gently returned on him the weapons he had hurled against the innocent and worthy. These early fruits of his genius were applauded by all the learned men of the times.

He returned into his own country adorned with the laurels of the muses, and filled there posts of great honour and authority, was eminent for his virtues, and distinguished with the favour and friendship of Prince RADZIVILIUS, whose cause he pleaded in his Apology. His name was rendered illustrious by his valour in the field and his wisdom in the cabinet, by his persuasive eloquence and invincible fortitude. His mind did not sink into indolence through leisure, nor grow effeminate amidst the pleasures of a court. But he was employed in the most important business, his judgment was improved by experience, and he did not entirely neglect lighter studies. During his residence in the court of RADZIVILIUS, he drew up the Life of SOCINUS, and a Panegyric on ULADISLAUS SIGISMUND, King of *Poland*, in which he extolled his clemency to the DISSIDENTS, and the advantages
the

the republic derived from it. He also wrote other books on some interesting subjects, and composed a History of the UNITARIAN Churches in *Poland*, which perished in the storm of persecution that overwhelmed the followers of SOCINUS.

At that time PRZIRCOWIUS was stripped of his honours and estates and driven out of his country. The PAPISTS invited this illustrious man over to their party by great and flattering promises. But, though he did not agree with his UNITARIAN brethren * in all points, he chose rather to follow CHRIST with them through poverty into banishment, and to perish even with want, than to violate in the least instance the dictates of his conscience that he might abound in wealth and opulence.

Though there was not a perfect agreement in opinion between him and them, yet the UNITARIANS highly respected him for his uncommon acquaintance with theological subjects, and for his skill and long experience in the management of affairs. On these accounts, and because his name was

* He entertained different sentiments from the generality of the SOCINIANS concerning the office of magistracy, the duration of CHRIST's kingdom and power, and the Person of the SAVIOUR, whom he believed to be merely and without a figure the Son of God, begotten of the divine Essence, yet not from all eternity.

was in great repute among foreigners, a Synod, held in *Silesia*, in 1663, devolved on him the business of holding a correspondence with their brethren in other nations, with a view of promoting the interest and increase of the whole community.

After he was banished from his country, the reputation of his virtues and learning procured him an asylum with the Elector of *Brandenburgh*, who constituted him his privy-counsellor.

From the profits of his post he maintained some families at his own house, pinching himself that more might be relieved by his kindness, and not making any provision for the future support of the widow of his only son and two grand-children by her, notwithstanding he was seventy years old and drawing near to the period of his existence, and could leave nothing to them but hunger, except the care of divine Providence.

In his exile, the time he could redeem from the duties of his post in the court he devoted to theological studies, and soothed the bitter reflections on his own calamities by his *Thoughts on the Sermon on the Mount and the apostolical Epistles**.

PRZIPCIVUS

* Bock remarks, that, though these *Thoughts* depart from the orthodox mode of interpretation, yet they are very

PRZIPCOVIUS lived to an advanced age, and enjoyed, when more than seventy, great bodily activity. In the decline of life new evils threatened him:

very useful for explaining the sacred text; as the sense and design of the writer is always pointed out, though in a very concise manner. The SOCINIAN interpretations are often adopted, but many things occur in which PRZIPCOVIUS entirely differs from them, or endeavours to support those explications by new arguments and illustrations. Of this BOCK gives the following example.

CRELLIUS, SCHLICHTINGIUS, and others, suppose the Apostle alludes, 1 Cor. xv. 29. to a practice received in the primitive Church, of baptizing a living person as representing one who had died unbaptized. They condemned indeed this as an erroneous custom, whilst they apprehended the Apostle reasoned from it as an *argumentum ad hominem*. PRZIPCOVIUS, besides adopting this interpretation, contends also that the ceremony was free from error and conducive to the edification of the Church, though not profitable to the dead. Baptism, he argues, being an external sign of a person's being added to the people of CHRIST, though, separated from regeneration, it was of no benefit to the baptized, yet was advantageous to the Church before whom it was administered, as it expressed an accession to the disciples of CHRIST, and invited others to join themselves to the Church. But if, says he, it be asked, how the Church can be supposed to be enlarged by the accession of the dead, when death seems rather to diminish it? I answer, on account of the Resurrection, those who had departed this life, as not having perished but remaining allied to the Church, were considered under that light. BOCK, *Hist. ANTITRIN.* T. i. pars 2. p. 678, 679.

him: for the Elector of *Brandenburgh*, contrary to his own inclinations, at the continued instigation of the Senate of *Prussia*, threatened him with a sentence of banishment from his dominions within the space of three years. But a sudden death prevented the execution of this sentence, and the repeated calamities of a new exile and of again changing his country. God discharged him from farther service, and rewarded his approved patience by a seasonable dismissal to his recompence. He died in the year 1670, seventy-eight years of age.

His deportment was graceful; and in his manner there appeared a dignity tempered with affability. In his natural temper he was quick and inclined to anger, but he had gained by reason and the principles of virtue such a mastery over his passions, that the sedateness of his temper, which was the effect of virtuous discipline, appeared the gift of nature. Though he did not embrace those high mysteries concerning the Son of God which all own exceed their comprehension, yet for the sake of this divine person he sustained the greatest hardships. He was stripped of his rich patrimony, deprived of all the means of supporting life, driven from his country, and exposed to immediate poverty. Yet he chose rather a wretched and destitute life than to be an apostate from his own conscience and the slave of the Pope. Surely a faith, which thus produced the highest

highest and most difficult fruits of love and obedience, though mingled with some errors, could not but be acceptable to the Son of God. In Popery, not only the tyrant, but the tyranny offended PRZIPCOWIUS; and he thought one cause, which had greatly impeded the Reformation, was, that the *French, Italians and Spaniards*, who breathed after liberty of conscience and a deliverance from the servitude of Anti-Christ, when they perceived the oppressions over conscience practised by the Reformed themselves, returned to their former faith: for it appeared to them more eligible to endure an old and rich master and old abuses, in calm and peaceable circumstances, than to risk all the dangers of a change, and to submit to the same inconveniences under new, poor and needy masters.

The Works of PRZIPCOWIUS, which are preserved in the collection we are speaking of, are, Divine Thoughts on the Beginning of MATTHEW'S Gospel and the apostolical Epistles. — A Dissertation on the Peace and Concord of the Church, formerly published under the name of IRENÆUS PHILALETHES. — An Apology against the Satyr of DANIEL HEINSIUS, entitled *Cras credo, hodie nihil*. — A Panegyric on ULADISLAUS SIGISMUND, King of Poland.

hand. — The Life of FAUSTUS SOCINUS*. — A Dissertation prefixed to the Works of SOCINUS. — Sentiments on a Book offered by Father NICHOLAS CICHOVIVS to the Senate of *Poland*. — An Apology for afflicted Innocence, to the Elector of *Brandenburgh*. — *Hyperaspistes*, or a Defence of an Apology for the afflicted Churches in *Poland*, presented to the Elector of *Brandenburgh* and to the Senate of *Prussia*, 1666. — Apologetical Animadversions on a Book of JOHN AMOS COMENIUS against the persecuted Churches in *Poland*. — An Answer to a Piece of GEORGE NEMIRICIUS SUC-CAMERARIUS, in which he invites all the Dissidents in *Poland* and *Lithuania* to join the *Greek Church*. A Demonstration that the Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST cannot be called his Father metaphorically, nor JESUS CHRIST stiled his only begotten Son by a Metaphor. — Religion vindicated from the Aspersions of ATHEISTS. — Animadversions on a Book concerning the Nature of CHRIST'S Kingdom. — A Treatise on the Rights of a Christian Magistrate and of private Persons in Peace and War. — An Apology for this Treatise. — A Vindication of the same Piece against the Objections of DANIEL ZWICKER.

Besides

* That PRZIPCOWIVS was the Author of this piece is past a doubt. In the copy of it, which BOCK has in his possession, the Author of it wrote his name in his own hand.

Besides the above works, PRZIPCOWIUS left many M.S. tracts and pieces: the reader, perhaps, will be gratified by the following little piece, which is a comparison of the Apostle's Creed with those of modern Christians.

1.
I believe in one GOD,
the Father Almighty, the
Maker of heaven and
earth.

2.
I believe in JESUS
CHRIST, the only begot-
ten Son of the Creator
of all things.

3.
I believe that this only
begotten Son of GOD
was

1.
I believe in three di-
vine persons, consubstan-
tial, equal to each other,
each of which is the su-
preme GOD, and who
created the heavens and
earth, by the exercise of
equal power and effi-
cacy.

2.
I believe in JESUS
CHRIST, partaker of the
same numerical essence,
and one GOD with the
unbegotten Father, and
himself the Creator of
heaven and earth.

3.
I believe that from
this only begotten Son
did

was conceived by the Holy Spirit.

did the Holy Spirit, from all eternity, proceed, and will proceed.

4.

I believe that this Son of God was born of the virgin MARY.

4.

I believe that this Son of God, co-eval and co-eternal with the unbegotten Father and the Holy Spirit, existed countless ages before MARY was born in time, and will continually be deriving from the Father.

5.

I believe that, this only begotten son, *i. e.* his entire person, suffered under PONTIUS PILATE, was crucified, dead and buried, and descended into hell.

5.

I believe that, the person of this only begotten Son of God, and his divine nature remaining perfect and untouched, his human nature only, not any other person, suffered under PONTIUS PILATE, was crucified, dead and buried, and descended into hell.

6.

6.

6.

I believe that the Son of God, was by God the Father, (*Acts* ii. 24, 32. iii. 15, 26. iv. 10. x. 40. xiii. 30, 37. xvii. 31. *Rom.* iv. 24. viii. 11. 1 *Cor.* vi. 14. xv. 15. 2 *Cor.* iv. 14. *Gal.* i. 1. *Eph.* i. 20. *Col.* ii. 12. 1 *Theff.* i. 10. *Heb.* xiii. 2.) on the third day, raised from the dead.

7.

I believe that the Son of God, after his Resurrection, was exalted, and sat down at the right-hand of the Father Almighty.

8.

I believe that the Son
of God will come from
heaven

6.

I believe that the Son
of GOD raised his human
nature from the dead by
his own proper strength
and power.

7.

I believe that the Son of GOD, from all eternity, hath sat down with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and will continue to reside with them to all eternity, reigning on a heavenly throne and possessed with equal power.

8.

I believe that the Son
of God, being himself the
G g most

heaven to judge the living and the dead.

9.

I believe in the Holy Spirit, *i. e.* the gifts communicated and poured out from the Father, through the Son, on believers.

10.

I believe in the holy catholic, or universal, Church, which receiveth and acknowledgeth all the articles of the Apostle's Creed, that are embraced by all CHRISTIANS, as alone essential and necessary; and which admits to communion all holy and virtuous persons, though differing in points

most high God, whose essence is every where and filleth all places, has no need to make any descent for judging the living and the dead.

9.

I believe in the person of the Holy Spirit, co-eternal and equal with the Father and the Son, and yet proceeding from each.

10.

I believe in that particular holy Church that is distinct from all others, in which I was born and baptized, (for instance, the *Roman*, the *Greek*, the *Augustine*, or the *Reformed*,) which embraces doctrines and creeds formed many ages since the Apostles, and expells from its communion and treats

points of less importance.

11.

I believe in the communion of the saints, i. e. of all who live a holy life, though on some points they do not agree with us.

treats as heretics whomsoever dareth to doubt the least article held by it.

11.

I believe that I should abhor the communion of those who in the least dissent from the dogmas of my Church, though their lives and manners be most pure and holy. Such condemned assemblies are, in the judgment of the *Papists*, the *Greek*, the *Augustine*, the *Reformed*, and all besides the *Roman Church*. Such, according to the *Greek Church*, are the *Papists*, the *Augustines*, the *Reformed*, and all besides their own. Such, with the *Augustine Church*, are the *Papists*, the *Greeks*, the *Reformed*, and all besides the *Lutherans*. Such, in the opinion of some of

12.

G g 2

the

the *Reformed*, are the *Papists*, the *Greeks*, and all others besides. And accordingly these respective Churches exclude whom they deem such from their communion.

12.

I believe in the forgiveness of sins, which can be no otherwise than free and gratuitous.

12.

I believe in a satisfaction made for our sins and a price paid for them.

13.

I believe in the resurrection of the flesh, when, according to PAUL, 1 Cor. xv. we shall have bodies, not natural, animal, earthly, ignominious and weak, as we derive from ADAM, but spiritual, heavenly, glorious, incorruptible, which we shall receive of the Lord from heaven, because flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*.

13.

I believe in the resurrection of the flesh, in which we shall have such and the same bodies as we derive from ADAM: because those bodies which consist of flesh, blood, bones, nerves, veins and arteries, can inherit the kingdom of God.

APPENDIX.

* Bock, Hist. ANTITRIN. T. i. pars 2. p. 693—697.

APPENDIX. III.

Propositions, in which is explained the Opinion of FRANCIS DAVID concerning the Character of CHRIST, together with the opposite Propositions of the Church, drawn up by FAUSTUS SOCINUS, and presented to CHRISTOPHER BATHORY, the illustrious Prince of *Transylvania*.

The Propositions of FRANCIS DAVID.

Those of the Church.

JESUS of Nazareth, who is called CHRIST, spake not by the prophetic spirit but by the Holy Spirit: *i. e.* though he were the ambassador of God, yet the words he spake, when he taught, are

JESUS of Nazareth, who is called CHRIST, spake not only by the prophetic spirit but by a superior spirit; since he was the express image of God, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the God-head.

FRANCIS DAVID.

are not to be considered as proceeding from the mouth of God himself.

2.

This is the reason why the words of CHRIST and those of his Apostles are to be tried by the test of the MOSAIC law and the prophetic oracles. And if any thing be found or appear to occur in the former, contrary to or different from the latter, it is either to be rejected, or to be interpreted consistently with the doctrine of MOSES and the Prophets, which alone ought to be to us the rule of life and religious worship.

The CHURCH.

head bodily; so that he did not, in teaching, utter even one word which may not be considered as spoken by the mouth of God himself.

2.

This is the reason that the words of CHRIST and those of his Apostles carry such weight with them, that whatever, in the writings of MOSES and the Prophets, oppose them, or appear to contradict them, is to be either rejected, or to be interpreted by them; which have not only explained, when it was necessary, MOSES and the Prophets, but have in part repealed them, and in part fulfilled and completed them, and from which every rule of manners, of life and of worship, is to be drawn.

3.

FRANCIS DAVID.

3.

For no difference is to be supposed between the old covenant established by MOSES, or the new confirmed by CHRIST, either in doctrine (especially so far as is relative to manners) or in divine promises: but in this respect only are they said to differ, that under the former there was the ministry of the letter, but under the latter that of the spirit: so that in other respects it ought not to be said that the one hath abrogated, or in any degree changed, but only confirmed, the other.

4.

Especially since this new covenant existed only for a short season,

i. e.

The CHURCH.

3.

For as great a difference is to be supposed between the old covenant established by MOSES and the new confirmed by CHRIST, as between the shadow of a body and the body itself: both in doctrine (even as relative to manners) and in great divine promises is this difference to be acknowledged: so that, laying aside the old, (unless where it agree with the new) we should rest satisfied with the latter, which hath not only changed, but even abrogated the former.

4.

Especially since the new covenant is eternal, and must endure to the

G g 4

end

FRANCIS DAVID.

The Church.

i. e. till the destruction of *Jerusalem*; and after that neither had nor will have any power, in any part of it, till CHRIST shall come again to us, and shall reign with perfect sanctity and righteousness in this world over the people of *Israel*, after the manner of other earthly kings, in the city of *Jerusalem*, which is to be rebuilt.

5.

In the mean time, JESUS is not really the CHRIST, or the King of God's people, but only by designation; when it is certain, from all the Prophets, that the CHRIST promised by God would have

end of the world; neither ever hath, nor can in any part of it cease, till CHRIST, descending from heaven, shall come again to judge the living and the dead, and shall bestow on them who have embraced and kept this covenant the reward of an eternal and heavenly life, and shall inflict on those who have rejected it, or, after having embraced, have violated it, the punishment of eternal death.

5.

In the mean time, JESUS is truly the CHRIST, or the King of God's people: moreover, the kingdom of the CHRIST promised by God was to be not an earthly but a future and heavenly one; as

FRANCIS DAVID. *The Church*

have no other than an as Jesus himself and his
earthly kingdom, and Disciples have shewn by
such as hath been men- their explanation of the
tioned above. divine oracles.

6.

6.

JESUS was sent by God into the world to take immediate possession of such a kingdom; but because the Jews, to whom he was promised, and whose King he ought to have been, would not receive him, after he had been slain by them, contrary to the divine purpose, God removed him from them, and translated him to a place where he liveth in a safe and quiescent state under the divine protection.

That JESUS might obtain a kingdom of this nature, it was, according to the command and decree of God, necessary that he should undergo the death of the cross, which was to be brought upon him, according to the purpose of God, by the Jews, to whom he was expressly sent. This having taken place, he was raised from the dead by God, and translated into the true heaven; where he sits at the right-hand of God, i. e. enjoyeth, next to the supreme Deity, universal power over the Church in heaven and on earth.

FRANCIS DAVID.

The Church.

7.

There he passeth an inactive existence, waiting till God hath subdued all his enemies unto him, and so he shall possess the kingdom promised to himself.

8.

He is not therefore any more to be called God, as perhaps, when he was conversant in the world, he might be, on account of his office; for this office, as we have said, hath now ceased.

9.

7.

Therefore, having thus obtained the kingdom promised to himself, he governs the whole Church; and at the same time, by means of the divine power communicated to him, and the over-ruling agency of God in subduing his enemies, he enjoyeth rest till he hath subjected all things to him except one, *i. e.* death.

8.

He may therefore, with the utmost propriety, be called God; since he filleth an office of the greatest dignity, and is invested with the highest divine power in heaven and earth.

9.

FRANCIS DAVID.

9.

On this account they are in a sad error who worship him now absent, as this implieth in it divine adoration; when, even while he were on earth, he could not be worshipped with any other than civil homage without incurring the high displeasure of God.

10.

Therefore we neither can nor ought to serve him, or pay him reverence in any other way, besides by obeying him, *i. e.* by keeping his precepts.

11.

Neither ought we ever to confide in him, unless

The Church.

9.

On this account, though absent, religious adoration is to be paid to him; when, even before he received his kingdom, while he dwelt on earth, he was deservedly worshipped with more than civil homage: they who neglect it offend shamefully against God.

10.

Therefore we are altogether obliged, besides the observance of his commands, to serve and worship him, as appointed by the supreme Being to be our Lord and God, and as now in the fullest degree reigning over us.

11.

And we ought to place our hope and trust in him

FRANCIS DAVID.

unless so far as to believe the truth of the things he spoke, and to entertain firm hopes of receiving the blessings he promised in the name of God.

12.

To invoke him, *i. e.* to implore his aid and assistance in our necessities is the same thing as if any one should pray unto the virgin MARY, or other dead saints, who have never given us any evidence that they can either hear our prayers, or bestow any thing upon us.

13.

Neither can we ask him, any more than the aforefaid dead saints, to pray on our account to God, or to obtain any thing of God: for he certainly

The Church.

him as in that person who, with the approbation of God, hath himself promised, and can bestow upon us, the greatest felicity.

12.

And to invoke him, *i. e.* to implore his aid and assistance in our necessities, is the same as if any one pray unto God himself; since it is certain, that, by power from God, he can both hear our prayers and grant what things we want.

13.

We may even ask him to pray to God on our account, and to obtain of God favours for us; yet so that, by these modes of expression, we acknowledge

FRANCIS DAVID.

certainly discharged no more than they any duty of a Mediator between God and us. As to what is written, that he intercedeth with God for us, it only means, that the prayers which he offered up to God, while on earth, for all who should believe in him, are still efficacious in the sight of God.

14.

His priesthood moreover (if he ever were a proper priest) ended then, when he expired on the cross;

The Church.

acknowledge before God that all the power of assisting us, possessed by Christ, he derived not from himself but God; for, in this sense, the Scripture saith, he intercedeth for us. For he is a Mediator between God and us in a more eminent degree in heaven, than he was on earth. On earth he announced the goodness of God to us and prayed to him for us: in heaven he carries into effect the same goodness; and all the blessings, which are derived from God to the Church, are given through him.

14.

His priesthood moreover is eternal; with which he was then truly invested, when, after the death

FRANCIS DAVID.

cross; nor did nor could be in any other way profitable to us than that, on account of the permanent efficacy of the offering of himself, his priesthood is said to be everlasting, and he is called a priest for ever: and perhaps in this view it is written that he hath expiated our sins.

15.

Therefore, CHRIST being permitted to pass a quiet inactive life, we may believe that we are not

The CHURCH.

death of the cross, entering into the heavenly sanctuary, the true holy of holies, he appeared in the presence of God for us; where the offering of himself made unto God, not only by the efficacy of any transaction already past, but chiefly by the virtue of his presence with God, is profitable to us, so far as, by this offering, he hath obtained that supreme power by which the Scriptures most plainly assert he always expiates our sins, *i. e.* continually and for ever delivers us from the punishment of our sins.

15.

Therefore, since we have such a priest in heaven, set over the house of God, who, living for ever, can

FRANCIS DAVID.

not now assisted by him, or his influence with God; any farther than as, while he was on earth, he shewed to man the way of salvation, and taught the method of drawing nigh to God; till, when about to receive a kingdom, he shall return to us and become truly the CHRIST of God; and, being personally present in this world, shall cherish and support us by the power of God. In the mean time, let us flee always to God alone, not trusting in the power of CHRIST, or his presence and help*.

This paper shews the great difference between SOCINUS and FRANCIS DAVID in the sentiments they entertained concerning the character of CHRIST

The Church.

can always save to the utmost those who come to God by him, confiding in his power and presence, let us never cease to offer up our prayers to our God and Father through him, till, coming from heaven, he shall transform our vile bodies and render them like to his glorious body, by that power by which he, who is now truly the CHRIST, can subdue all things to himself.

* SOCINI Opera, tom. ii. p. 801—803.

CHRIST and the Christian scheme. Most persons will be disposed to consider those of FRANCIS DAVID as derogatory to the glory and excellency of the Gospel, and as bearing a greater resemblance to JUDAISM than to CHRISTIANITY. Hence he and his disciples were called SEMI-JUDAIZERS. MOSHEIM seems to consider this name merely as an ignominious appellation, bestowed upon them by the SOCINIANS from a spirit of rancour and with a view to render them odious: but I apprehend the reader will be ready to conclude, from the above Theses, that it was really grounded on their sentiments, and expressive of the partial preference they gave to the law of MOSES above the gospel of CHRIST. It is certain that the *Invocation of CHRIST* was not the only point of difference between them and the SOCINIANS; but all the ideas of these two sects, concerning the present dignity of CHRIST and the perfection of his religion, were totally opposite to each other. It looks as if the former had recourse to peculiar notions on those heads in order to evade the force of SOCINUS's arguments for the worship of him, from the high trust and vast power and dominion with which he was invested by GOD. The modern UNITARIANS, who have denied the worship of CHRIST, have been far from running into notions of his office so derogatory to his dignity, which evidently deprive his disciples of the consolation

consolation flowing from the contemplation of his character, and tending to enervate the weight and authority of his precepts. Though, with SOCINUS, they believe that our Lord does now actually sustain the office of High-Priest for us in heaven, ministering to God and acting for us; and that he filleth a station of great power and dignity; yet they do not see the force of these conclusions, which he drew from these sentiments, to vindicate the worship of CHRIST.

“ He cannot (says the worthy Mr. LINDSEY)
 “ be the God to whom prayer is to be offered
 “ when he is the High-Priest of that God, his Mi-
 “ nister, to appear in the presence of God for us,
 “ *Heb. ix. 24.* to make intercession for us, *ch. vii.*
 “ *25.* What a strange thing would it have been
 “ for the Jews to have worshipped AARON, their
 “ high-priest, instead of the great JEHOVAH whom
 “ AARON served? The idea exhibited to us of
 “ our Redeemer in this Epistle is this, and it is full
 “ of consolation, that, by his love and friendship
 “ for us, joined to his power and interest with God,
 “ and the divine promises by him, we are encou-
 “ raged to ask of God, in prayer, the supply of all
 “ our wants; and are therefore exhorted to come
 “ *boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain*
 “ *mercy and find grace to help in time of need.*
 “ *Ch. iv. 16.*”

H h

“ That

“ That the Lord JESUS is intrusted with a mighty
 “ extensive power and dominion, for the good of
 “ his Church and people, is plainly and expressly
 “ revealed to us, *Matt.* xxviii. 18, 20. *John* xiv. 14.
 “ *Ephes.* i. 22, 23. *1 Cor.* xv. 24. *Phil.* ii. 9, 10.
 “ &c. &c.”

“ How and in what manner he exerciseth his
 “ power is wholly unrevealed, and therefore un-
 “ searchable by us, as much as the way and manner
 “ of GOD’s providence, under which CHRIST act-
 “ eth, and which superintends and over-rules all
 “ things.”

“ Love, honour, reverence, duty, confidence,
 “ gratitude and obedience, are, and will be certain-
 “ ly for ever due from us of mankind to the Lord
 “ JESUS, for his immense love to us, and on ac-
 “ count of his perfect holiness, excellency, power,
 “ dignity and dominion; but religious worship is
 “ the incommunicable honour and prerogative of
 “ GOD alone*.”

It appears, from the general strain of his writings,
 that SOCINUS knew not how to reason in this man-
 ner

* MOSHEIM’s *Ecclesiastical History*, Cent. 16. §. 3.
 Part 2. or V. 4. P. 200, 201. 8vo Edit. 1768.
 LINDSEY’S *Apology*, P. 127, 136, 137, 138.

ner concerning the INVOCATION of CHRIST, or the addressing of prayers to him. He always freely admitted that this was never required in Scripture, but was to be reckoned among those things concerning which there is no command or prohibition in the New Testament; yet he thought and contended that the Invocation of CHRIST was a duty necessarily arising from the character he sustained as head of the Church, and from the power and dominion with which he was invested. “ There-
 “ fore (says he) I so strongly press this point, that
 “ my adversary, acknowledging that our prayers
 “ may be directed to him, may consequently own
 “ and declare, that CHRIST, residing in heaven, is
 “ endowed with all power in heaven and in earth,
 “ and governs and directs the whole Church.”
 On this principle, because the persons who, in those times, denied the Invocation of CHRIST, also discarded the belief of his present supreme power and government, SOCINUS was persuaded they did not deserve to be called CHRISTIANS.

However, it doth not appear that he considered such as not in a salvable state; for, on this controversy, he distinguished between things connected with salvation and things connected with religion; and observes, that, though the latter include the former, yet they are far more extensive, and reach

to many points that do not affect the salvation of men, though the discussion of them be very important in order to attain to just sentiments concerning religion, and to the pure profession of it.

It is therefore scarcely a fair representation of the learned MOSHEIM, when he says, "that SOCI-
 "NUS himself expressly acknowledges, that this
 "controversy turns upon matters of very little im-
 "portance, by declaring it as his opinion, that
 "praying or offering up divine worship to CHRIST
 "is not necessary to salvation. Thus, (our valua-
 "ble Historian proceeds) in his Answer to WU-
 "JECK, he expresses himself in the following man-
 "ner: The Christian, whose faith is so great as to
 "encourage him to make his addressees habitually
 "and directly to the Supreme Being, and who
 "standeth not in need of the comfort that flows
 "from the Invocation of CHRIST, his brother, who
 "was tempted in all things like as he is, *that*
 "*Christian is not obliged to call upon the name of*
 "*JESUS by prayer and supplication. Quod si quis*
 "*tanta est fide præditus, ut ad DEUM ipsum perpetuo*
 "*recta accedere audeat, nec consolatione quæ ex*
 "*CHRISTI fratris sui per omnia tentati invocatione*
 "*proficiscitur, indigeat, hic non opus habet, ut CHRIS-*
 "*TUM invocet.* According, therefore, to the opi-
 "nion of SOCINUS, those, who lay aside all regards

“ to CHRIST as an *Intercessor*, and address them-
 “ selves *directly* to GOD *alone*, have a greater mea-
 “ sure of faith than others. But, if this be so, why
 “ did he oppose, with such vehemence and animos-
 “ ity, the sentiments of DAVIDES, who, in effect,
 “ did no more than exhort all Christians to address
 “ themselves *directly* and *immediately* to the Fa-
 “ ther.”

The above passage was urged against SOCINUS by
 WUJECK, BELLARMINE and others, who construed
 it as implying, if not asserting, “ that it was an in-
 “ stance of more perfect faith to be able to address
 “ directly the Supreme Being.” SOCINUS disavows
 this sense of the passage, and endeavours to prove
 that it affords no grounds for such conclusions.
 He pleads that he only *supposes* a case which has
 never happened, and that his words are to be taken
 thus: “ Although it doth not seem possible, that any
 “ one should be possessed of so great faith as to
 “ make his addressee, &c. yet, if such a person be
 “ to be found, he hath *no need* to invoke CHRIST.”
 For, SOCINUS urges, that he had a little before said,
 that the Invocation of CHRIST was designed to
 confirm our faith and assist our weakness. There-
 fore it could not be justly concluded, from these
 words, that it was great perfection to pray directly
 to GOD, without the mediation of CHRIST, but that there

there was no one who had not occasion to call upon
 CHRIST by prayer or supplication. — “ But suppose
 “ (he adds, speaking of himself in the third person)
 “ that the words of SocINUS are to be explained as
 “ they assert, viz. that there *are* some men whose
 “ faith is so great and firm that they have no occa-
 “ sion to invoke CHRIST, it will not follow from
 “ hence, that he affirmed it was an instance of per-
 “ fection to address GOD immediately, omitting
 “ all regard to CHRIST. Yet it should seem that
 “ they judge this to be his opinion, and that he
 “ thought so established and perfect a Christian
 “ *ought to abstain* from calling on CHRIST by prayer:
 “ whereas, from their explanation of his words, the
 “ only point to be drawn from them is this, that a
 “ man endowed with so eminent and firm a faith
 “ *doth not stand in need* of the consolation flowing
 “ from the Invocation of CHRIST. For the words
 “ which immediately follow prove it was SocINUS’s
 “ opinion that so perfect a Christian would act
 “ *rightly*, in calling on CHRIST by prayer. These
 “ are his words: The man possessed of the greatest
 “ faith in GOD, if he should pray unto CHRIST,
 “ will not only not displease GOD, but, by this
 “ action, will render him glory, and express his
 “ gratitude for the great power bestowed, in the
 “ person of CHRIST, on human nature itself.

The

The Reader will judge how clearly or justly Socinus explains his own meaning and guards his words from misconstructions; and, perhaps, will be ready to think that Mosheim had never consulted the works of Socinus on this point, but adopted the quotation and the conclusions grounded on it from some other author. If the matter should appear in this light, it will be a lesson of caution to us in reading great and respectable authors, as even the most laborious and impartial writers are apt sometimes to take things on trust, and to give us only the sentiments and representations of those who have gone before them*.

* Mosheim, ut supra: et Socini Opera, Tom. iii. P. 538, 539.

F I N I S.

BOOKS published by J. TOULMIN, A. M. and sold by
J. JOHNSON, No. 72, St. Paul's Church-Yard.

REFLECTIONS on the Death of a PRINCE and a GREAT
MAN, in a Sermon on the Death of the Duke of
CUMBERLAND. Price 6d.

Sermons principally addressed to Youth. To which
is added a translation of ISOCRATES's Oration to DEMO-
NICUS. Sewed, 2s. 6d.

The Observation of FESTIVALS and HOLIDAYS con-
sidered, in a Sermon preached at Taunton, on Christmas-
Day, 1770. Price 4d.

The Manner of contending for the Faith considered, in a
Sermon preached at Taunton: With a Letter to the Rev.
Mr. Rooker, occasioned by his Sermon on the same Sub-
ject. Price 8d.

A practical Discourse on the moral Uses and Obliga-
tions of Christian Baptism. Price 6d.

Two Letters on the late Applications to Parliament
by Protestant Dissenting Ministers. Price 2s.

*The Unsuccessfulness of CHRIST's Ministry and his Reward
with God*, considered, in a Sermon before the GENERAL
ASSEMBLY, held at the Baptist Meeting-House, in Bar-
bican, June 7, 1775.

The Duties Christians owe to their Ministers considered, in
a Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. THOMAS
TWINING, May 31, 1775. To which is added a Charge
by the Rev. Mr. STURCH. Price 1s.

The American War lamented, a Sermon preached at
Taunton, Feb. 18 and 25, 1776. Price 6d.

Lately Published,

An humble Attempt for the Instruction of Youth in
the Principles, Doctrines and Duties of Religion, natural
and revealed. Price 6d.

Toulmin, Joshua

Memoirs of the Life, Character, Sentiments and Writings of Faustus Socinus

London 1777

Biogr. 1100 b

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10067004-5